



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.


About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 3433 06183058 8

**THE HISTORIANS'
HISTORY
OF THE WORLD**





KNIGHT

THE HISTORIANS' HISTORY OF THE WORLD

A comprehensive narrative of the rise and development of nations
as recorded by over two thousand of the great writers of
all ages: edited, with the assistance of a distinguished
board of advisers and contributors,
by

HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS, LL.D.




IN TWENTY-FIVE VOLUMES
VOLUME XXI—SCOTLAND, IRELAND,
ENGLAND SINCE 1792

The Outlook Company
New York

The History Association
London

1904



COPYRIGHT, 1904,
By HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS.

All rights reserved.

Press of Publishers' Printing Company
32 Lafayette Place, New York

WILLIAMS
ALLEN L. HENRY
WILSON FOUNDATIONS



BOOK IV

THE HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY TO THE DEATH OF MACBETH

[80-1058 A.D.]

If we except the Athenians and the Jews, no people so few in number have scored so deep a mark in the world's history as you Scots have done.—J. A. FROUDE.^b

"THE name of Scotia, or Scotland, whether in its Latin or its Saxon form, was not applied to any part of the territory forming the modern kingdom of Scotland till towards the end of the tenth century," says Skene.^c "That part of the island of Britain which is situated to the north of the firths of Forth and Clyde seems indeed to have been known to the Romans as early as the first century by the distinctive name of Caledonia, and it also appears to have borne from an early period another appellation, the Celtic form of which was *Albu*, *Alba*, or *Alban*, and its Latin form *Albania*. The name of *Scotia*, however, was exclusively appropriated to the island of Ireland.¹

"Ireland was emphatically *Scotia*, the *patria*, or mother country, of the Scots. From the tenth to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries the name of *Scotia*, gradually superseding the older name of *Alban*, or *Albania*, was con-

[¹ "*Scotus* is, in fact, simply the Latin name for Gael," says Sir J. H. Ramsay.^a J. Rhys,^e however, thinks that, as the Picts were so called by the Romans because they painted themselves (*picti*, compare our derivative, "picture"), so the name *Scotti* comes from the Roman retention of a Celtic word "*Scotti*," meaning carved or painted, *i.e.*, tattooed or disfigured.]

CONTENTS

VOLUME XXI

BOOK IV. SCOTLAND

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
EARLY HISTORY TO THE DEATH OF MACBETH (80-1058 A.D.) . . .	1

An early account of land and people (by Lindsay of Pitcottie), 2. The Romans in Scotland, 3. Roman relics in Britain, 6. The earliest races in Scotland, 6. The conversion of Scotland; the work of St. Columba, 8. Strathclyde, Dalriada, and conflicts with the future England, 10. Early Pictish kings: Brude (706 A.D.) to Angus McFergus, 12. Picts and Scots united by Kenneth Macalpine (844-860 A.D.), the Norse invasions, 13. Growth of the Celtic kingdom of Scone, 15. The kingdom of Alba: Constantine II, the first great Scottish king, 16. From Malcolm I to Malcolm II, 17. The name Scotia comes into use, 18. Duncan and Macbeth, 19. William Robertson on the real Macbeth, 20.

CHAPTER II

FROM MALCOLM CANMORE TO DAVID I (1058-1153 A.D.) . . .	23
--	----

Malcolm (III) Canmore begins a new era, 23. The Treaty of Abernethy, 24. E. Wm. Robertson's account of the English claims in Scotland, 25. Early forgeries and interpolations, 25. The alleged submission of Constantine II, 27. Malcolm I and Malcolm II, 27. William the Conqueror and Malcolm Canmore, 28. The true meaning of "Homage," 30. Last years of Malcolm and his queen Margaret, 33. Donald Bain to Alexander I, 34. David I, 36. Varying estimates of David's reign, 36. The great achievements of David I, 39. David compared with Alfred the Great, 43.

CHAPTER III

THE LAST CELTIC KINGS (1153-1286 A.D.)	45
--	----

Malcolm IV, "The Maiden," 45. William the Lion becomes an English captive, 47. The Treaty of Falaise makes Scotland a dependent kingdom, 47. Richard Cœur de Lion releases Scotland, 48. William's conflict with the pope, 49. Alexander II at war with John of England, 53. Alexander III is overawed by Henry of England, 53. The Norse invasion of Hakon repulsed, 54. The maiden of Norway, 55. Review of the period, 56. The Tanists and the clans, 57. Influence of foreigners, 58. Spread of English early poetry, 59. Trade and the state of society, 60.

CHAPTER IV

	PAGE
THE DAYS OF WALLACE (1286-1305 A.D.)	62

The maiden of Norway and the disputed succession, 62. Edward I makes John Baliol king; his revolt, 64. The rise of Wallace, 68. Robert Bruce joins Wallace, 70. The capitulation at Irvine, 71. Wallace wins at Stirling Bridge (September 14th, 1297), 72. Wallace invades England, 74. Wallace is made guardian of Scotland, 75. Edward invades Scotland, and wins at Falkirk, 76. Wallace resigns the guardianship; the pope claims Scotland, 77. The capture and execution of Wallace (August 23rd, 1305), 79. Freeman's estimate of William Wallace, 80. Estimates of Wallace by Burton, Murison, and Rosebery, 81.

CHAPTER V

ROBERT BRUCE (1305-1331 A.D.)	83
---	----

The early vacillations of Robert Bruce, 85. Bruce kills his rival, the Red Comyn, 87. Bruce is crowned at Scone, and put to flight, 89. Bruce returns to the contest, 92. The death of Edward I and accession of Edward II, 93. The rapid triumph of Bruce, 95. The truce of 1309 and the declaration of the clergy, 96. Deficiencies of the Scotch army, 98. Incidents and effects of Bannockburn, 99. Edward Bruce appointed heir; he invades Ireland, 104. Bruce in conflict with the pope, 105. The fight for Berwick, 106. The chapter of Mitton; a truce declared, 108. The Scotch parliament of 1318, 109. The manifesto of Aberbrothock or Arbroath, 110. A war of conspiracies, 111. Edward's defeat: end of the twenty-three years' war, 112. Reconciliation with the pope; alliance with France, 113. Edward III fails in an invasion, 114. The treaty of Northampton recognises the integrity of Scotland, 115. The last days of Robert Bruce, 117. The death of Bruce as related by Froissart: Bruce's heart, 117. Tytler's estimate of Bruce, 119. Sir Walter Scott's estimate of Bruce, 121. A review of Scotch commerce and culture, 123.

CHAPTER VI

DAVID II AND THE BALIOLS (1329-1371 A.D.)	128
---	-----

David II and the regents, 128. The regency of Randolph, 129. The disinherited barons and Baliol's victory at Dupplin Muir, 130. The English reconquer Scotland at Halidon Hill, 132. Scotland rises again under Moray, 134. Regency of Robert the Stewart of Scotland, 136. The return of the young king David II, 137. David invades England and is captured at Neville's cross, 139. Robert the Stewart again becomes regent, 140. The last of the Baliols surrenders the crown to Edward III, 142. Edward's futile invasion, 142. David II returns from captivity, 143. The king's ransom, and Edward's efforts at a peaceful conquest of Scotland, 145. David divorces his wife; his death, 147. Progress of the country at this period, 147.

CHAPTER VII

THE ACCESSION OF THE STUARTS (1371-1424 A.D.)	149
---	-----

The turbulent nobility and the border feuds, 151. John de Vienne and the French allies in Scotland, 153. Froissart's account of Otterburn or Chevy Chase, 155. The death of Douglas: prowess of Scots and English, 157. Last years of

CONTENTS

ix

PAGE

Robert II, 159. The earl of Carrick becomes Robert III, 160. Rivalry of the dukes of Rothesay and Albany, 161. War with Henry IV of England, 162. The death of Rothesay, 162. Douglas loses to Hotspur at Homildon, 163. Capture of James; death of Robert III; regency of Albany, 164. The lord of the isles defeated at Harlaw, 165. The regency of Murdoch, and the liberation of James I, 167. First religious persecutions, 168. Agriculture and commerce, 169.

CHAPTER VIII

ROYALTY *VERSUS* NOBILITY—JAMES I TO JAMES III (1424–1487 A.D.) . . . 170

James I attacks the power of the lords, 171. James reduces the lord of the isles to obedience, 173. War with England, 174. The murder of James I, 175. Tytler's estimate of James I, 178. The minority of James II; Crichton vs. Livingston, 180. The "Black Dinner," 181. The king crushes the power of the Douglas, 184. Last years and death of James II, 187. Mary of Guelders and Bishop Kennedy in control, 189. The acquisition of the Orkney and Shetland islands, 190. Treaty with England, 191. James' enmity to his brothers, 193. The rebellion of Albany and the English war, 194. A new revolt and the death of James III, 197. Pitcottie's account of the death of James III, 198. Tytler's estimate of James III, 199.

CHAPTER IX

JAMES IV AND FLODDEN FIELD (1488–1513 A.D.) . . . 202

The naval victories of Sir Andrew Wood, 203. The restoration of order, 204. James IV supports Perkin Warbeck, 205. Peaceful relations with England; the king marries the princess Margaret, 206. The Scotch navy; the conquest of Donald Dhu, 208. James comes in conflict with Henry VIII, 210. The disastrous war with England, and James' death on Flodden Field, 213. Scotch feudalism, 215. War customs, 218. The universities, 221. Poetry, 222. Ecclesiastical affairs, 223.

CHAPTER X

JAMES V AND MARY STUART (1513–1567 A.D.) . . . 226

The minority of James V, 226. Douglas against Hamilton, 228. The regency of Albany, 228. Albany's second regency and failure, 229. Angus gains control, 231. James V assumes the authority, 233. James declines to join Henry VIII against Rome, 234. James' resistance to the reformation, 236. War with Henry VIII, 238. The mutiny at Fala Moor; Solway Moss, and the death of James V, 239. Arran regent: under the sway of Cardinal Beaton, 240. The martyrdom of Wishart and the murder of Beaton, 242. The disaster at Pinkie and the marriage alliance with France, 244. Mary of Lorraine becomes regent, 245. The early career of John Knox, 246. The regent and the reformers, 248. The first covenant: the lords of the congregation, 249. Martyrdom of Myln: the parties in arms, 250. The lords of the congregation depose the regent and receive money from Elizabeth, 253. English and Scotch troops fight side by side, 255. Death of Mary of Lorraine; peace declared, 256. The parliament of 1560, 257. Presbyterianism established, 258. Vandalism of the reformers, 261. The return of Mary Queen of Scots, 262. Mary Stuart as queen and prisoner, 265.

CHAPTER XI

	PAGE
CROWN AGAINST KIRK, JAMES VI (1567-1625 A.D.) . . .	267

The regency of Moray, 267. The regencies of Lennox and Mar; the death of Knox, 270. Froude's estimate of Knox, 270. Carlyle's estimate of John Knox, 271. Beginning of the regency of Morton, 273. The fall of Morton, and accession of James VI, 275. The sway of Lennox and Arran, 276. The Ruthven raid (August 22nd, 1582), 276. James claims church supremacy; the black acts, 278. The alliance with Elizabeth, 279. Scotland and the armada, 280. The "Spanish Blanks," 281. James' marriage; his growing autocracy in the church, 282. Bothwell: the Octavians, 283. Andrew Melville rebukes the king, September, 1596, 284. The puzzle of the Gowrie conspiracy, 286. James VI becomes James I of England, 288. Culture of the period; Drummond and Napier, 289.

CHAPTER XII

THE GRADUAL UNION WITH ENGLAND (1603-1707 A.D.) . . .	291
---	-----

Scotland under Charles I; the Civil War, 292. Scotland rallies to Charles II; the commonwealth in power, 295. The restoration; the drunken parliament, 297. The new clergy and the persecutions of the old, 298. The tyrannies under Sharp, Burnet, and Lauderdale, 299. Letters of intercommuning, 303. The murder of Archbishop Sharp, 305. The insurrection of 1679; the Test Act and the "killing time" of 1681, 305. Wholesale persecution, inquisition, and torture, 307. The accession of James VII, 308. The revolution of 1688, 309. The accession of William and Mary; the convention parliament, 310. Hallam on the downfall of Episcopacy in Scotland, 311. The end of torture; the massacre at Glencoe, 312. The deserted colony of Darien, 316. Scotch opposition to the union with England, 316. Articles of union agreed upon, 318. Riots in Scotland, 320. The act of union consummated, 322. Aftermath of the union, 323. Commerce and culture of the nineteenth century, 326.

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS	328
---	-----

BOOK V. THE HISTORY OF IRELAND

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY AND THE ANGLO-NORMAN CONQUEST	331
---	-----

Legendary history of early races, 331. The Scoti, 333. Rise of Munster and conquest of Ulster, 334. Invasions of Britain by the Irish, 335. Christianity in Ireland, 337. The early Irish church, 339. The dynasty of the Hui Neill, 342. The reign of Aed, 343. The invasion of the Northmen, 345. The Scandinavian settlements, 347. The Dal-Cais dynasty, 349. Mathgamain and Brian, 350. Brian, the king of all Ireland, 351. The league against Brian, 353. The battle of Clontarf, 354. Ireland from the battle of Clontarf to the Anglo-Norman invasion, 355. Political and social state of Ireland in the early Middle Ages, 357. Households of the chiefs and kings, 359. Fosterage and marriage, 360. Dress, 362. Landholding, 363. Learned professions; the assemblies, 364. England and Ireland, 365. The Geraldines, 367. The coming of the Anglo-Normans, 369. Strongbow, 370. King Henry in Ireland, 374. Henry II's policy in Ireland, 376. The feudal system in Ireland, 378.

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER II

	PAGE
IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE	380

Ireland after the death of Henry II, 380. Edward Bruce in Ireland, 381. Anarchy and misrule, 385. The statute of Kilkenny, 386. The expeditions of Richard II, 387. Irish warfare in the fourteenth century, 389. Ireland under the three Henrys, 390. Ireland in the Wars of the Roses, 391. Henry VII and Poynings' Law, 392. The Geraldine supremacy, 394. The state of Ireland at Henry VIII's succession, 395. The revolt of Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, 397. The Irish church, 400. Edward VI and the reformation in Ireland, 402. The Irish policy of Queen Mary, 403. The plantations in Leix and Offaly, 405. The reign of Elizabeth, 406. The revolt of Shane O'Neill, 406. The Geraldine rebellion, 408. Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, 412. The revolt of O'Neill, 413. The battle of Yellow Ford, 414. Results of the Elizabethan conquest; religious policy, 418. Ireland under James I; the plantation of Ulster, 418. The Irish parliament, 419. Religious policy of James I, 420. Charles I and Stafford, 420. The insurrection of 1641, 421. Cromwell in Ireland, 423. The restoration, 425. James II: Londonderry and the Boyne, 426. The battle of the Boyne, 428. The siege and peace of Limerick, 432. William III; the penal laws, 434. Commercial restraints; the dissenters, 436. Social state of Ireland in the eighteenth century, 437. The Irish and the French Revolution, 438. The revolt of 1798, 440. The union, 443. Robert Emmet's insurrection, 444. Daniel O'Connell and Catholic emancipation, 445. O'Connell's later career, 446. Fenianism, 448.

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS	450
---	-----

BOOK VI. ENGLAND SINCE 1792

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS OF ENGLAND FROM 1792 TO 1815, by C. W. C.

OMAN	451
----------------	-----

The unpreparedness of Britain, 452. Outbreak of war, 454. The first stage of the war, 455. The condition of Ireland, 456. Naval mutinies, 457. Naval victories: a financial crisis, 458. The Irish rebellion, 458. The last stage of the war, 459. The Peace of Amiens, 461. Outbreak of the war with Bonaparte, 463. Napoleon's plans, 464. Futile attempt at invasion, 465. Nelson's victory and death, 466. Napoleon's successes on the land, 469. Napoleon's new project against England, 471. Bonaparte's supremacy, 472. Wellington in Spain, 474. Outbreak of war with the United States, 478. The fall of Napoleon, 479. The Peace of Ghent, 480. The end of Napoleon, 480. The state of England, 481.

CHAPTER II

REACTION AND REFORM (1816-1830 A.D.)	486
--	-----

Condition of the country, 486. Reforms in the criminal law, 490. The police of London, 492. Pauperism; Poor-law reform, 494. Education of the people; reforms, 496. The writings of Cobbett, 498. Hampden clubs; the Spenceans, 499. The Spa-Fields riot, 501. War with the Barbary States, 503. The Five Acts, 505.

	PAGE
Troops withdrawn from France, 507. Reforms of 1819, 507. The Manchester riots, 508. The Six Acts, 510. Death of George III, 511. The accession of George IV, 511. The Cato-Street conspiracy, 512. Sedition in Scotland, 514. Parliamentary reforms, 515. The trial of Queen Caroline, 516. Parliamentary reforms of 1821 A.D., 520. Coronation of George IV; death of the queen, 521. The king visits Ireland, Hanover, and Scotland, 523. The parliament of 1823 A.D., 524. Steps towards free trade, 526. Negro slavery in the West Indies, 527. Further reforms of the criminal law: "the Panic," 528. The question of Catholic emancipation, 531. Death of the duke of York and Lord Liverpool; the ministry of Canning, 532. England and Greek Independence, 534. Premiership of Lord Goderich; the battle of Navarino, 535. The duke of Wellington becomes premier, 537. Election for Clare of Daniel O'Connell, 540. The Catholic Relief Bill, 541. O'Connell's second return for Clare, 545. Death of George IV, 546.	

CHAPTER III

WILLIAM IV AND THE REFORM BILL (1830-1837 A.D.)	547
---	-----

Earl Grey forms a ministry, 549. Plans for parliamentary reform, 550. Parliament dissolved, 553. The new parliament rejects the Reform Bill, 554. Parliament prorogued; national excitement, 557. The Bristol riots, 558. The Reform Bill passed, 560. The cholera epidemic: parliament dissolved, 565. The first reformed parliament meets, 566. The Coercion Bill, the tithes, 567. The abolition of slavery, 568. The new Poor Law, 569. Fire destroys the houses of parliament, 570. The Melbourne ministry dismissed, 571. The first Peel ministry, 572. Lord Melbourne forms a new ministry, 574. Reform of municipal corporations, 575. The session of 1836, 577. Vital statistics: the newspaper stamp, 579. The death of William IV, 581. The king's life in retrospect, 582.

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA (1837-1856 A.D.)	584
--	-----

The queen's accession, 587. The bedchamber question, 592. The queen's marriage, 594. Public affairs, 596. The penny post, 597. Fiscal policy, 598. Sir Robert Peel's ministry, 600. The anti-corn-law agitation, 601. Free trade, 604. Lord Russell's ministry, 606. Irish famine; rebellion of 1848, 607. Commercial crisis; chartism, 609. Navigation acts; Ten-Hours Bill, 610. Death of Peel; the Oxford movement, 611. French scare, 612. Lord Derby's ministry, 613. The Aberdeen ministry, 614. The holy places, 614. The Crimean War, 615. Palmerston's ministry, 616.

CHAPTER V

HALF A CENTURY OF PROGRESS (1856-1900 A.D.)	618
---	-----

Indian Mutiny, 619. Orsini, 620. Lord Derby's second ministry, 621. Reform Bill, 622. Palmerston's second ministry, 623. Mr. Gladstone's budgets, 624. Paper duties repealed, 624. China war, 626. Unification of Italy, 627. Schleswig-Holstein question, 628. American Civil War, 630. Lord Russell's second ministry, 632. Lord Derby's third ministry, 632. Reform, 633. Disraeli prime minister, 634. The Irish church, 634. Abyssinian war, 635. Gladstone's first ministry, 635. Elementary

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
education, 636. Black Sea neutrality ; army purchase, 637. Governmental embarrassments, 638. Disraeli's second ministry, 639. "Bulgarian atrocities," 639. Afghan wars, 641. Zulu War, 642. Gladstone's second ministry ; Boer War of 1881, 643. The Bradlaugh question, 644. Parnell, 645. Egypt : the death of Gordon, 646. Lord Salisbury's ministry, 647. The new Salisbury ministry, 648. Gladstone again in power, 648. Gladstone and the Home Rule Bill of 1893 A.D., 650. Lord Rosebery, 650. Lord Salisbury ; the queen's jubilee, 651. African affairs, 652. Boer War, 653. The queen's last years and death, 654. A retrospective glance, 657. The accession of Edward VII, 658. Events of 1902-1904, 660.	

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS	662
---	-----

A CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D.	663
--	-----

PART XXII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

**BOOK IV, THE HISTORY OF SCOTLAND; BOOK V, THE
HISTORY OF IRELAND; BOOK VI, ENGLAND SINCE 1792**

BASED CHIEFLY UPON THE FOLLOWING AUTHORITIES

**A. ALISON, ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE, W. H. S. AUBREY, R. BAGWELL,
BEDE, P. DE BRANTÔME, H. F. BUCKLE, T. CARLYLE, CHRONICLE OF
THE PICTS AND SCOTS, LORD CLARENDON, E. A. FREEMAN, J. FROIS-
SART, J. A. FROUDE, GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, H. HALLAM, D.
HUME, P. W. JOYCE, C. KNIGHT, J. LINGARD, T. B. MACAU-
LAY, C. MACFARLANE, H. MARTINEAU, MATTHEW PARIS,
T. F. MAY, F. PALGRAVE, J. H. RAMSAY, A. G. RICHEY, W. SCOTT, P. H.
STANHOPE, W. STUBBS, TACITUS, R. VAUGHAN, WILLIAM OF MALMES-
BURY, T. WRIGHT**

TOGETHER WITH A CHAPTER ON

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLAND FROM 1792 TO 1815

BY

C. W. C. OMAN

WITH ADDITIONAL CITATIONS FROM

**P. ABERCROMBY, ADAMNAN, ÆNEAS SYLVIUS, ÆTHELWARD CHRONICLE,
ALLEN, AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, ANNALS OF THE FOUR MASTERS, P.
DE AYALA, J. BAIN, S. BAMFORD, L. A. BARBÉ, J. BARBOUR, BLIND
HARRY, W. BOECE, W. BOWER, G. BRODIE, H. BROUGHAM, P. H.
BROWN, G. BUCHANAN, G. BURNET, W. BURNS, J. H. BURTON,
J. CÆSAR, W. CAMDEN, G. CHALMERS, CHRONICLE OF
LANERCOST, CUMINIUS, J. DALRYMPLE, D. DEFOE, DION CASSIUS, ÆTHELRED
ÆLRED, LORD EXMOUTH, FERRERIUS, FLORENCE OF WORCESTER, A.
DE FONBLANQUE, J. DE FORDUN, H. B. GEORGE, GILDAS, A. GORDON,
LORD HAILES, L. HANSARD, HARLEIAN MISCELLANY, W. DE HEM-
INGBURGH, R. HOLINSHED, M. A. S. HUME, W. HUSKISSON,
C. INNES, IRISH ANNALS, JOCELIN, W. B. JONES, R. KERR,
H. KNIGHTON, J. KNOX, M. LAING, P. LANGTOFT, G. C. LEVEY, LIBER
PLUSCARDENSIS, R. LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE, G. LOCKHART, A. J. G.
MACKAY, J. MACKINNON, R. J. MACKINTOSH, J. MAJOR (MAIR),
T. R. MALTHUS, MARIANUS SCOTUS, T. MARTIN, MATTHEW OF
WESTMINSTER, J. MELVILLE, W. O'C. MORRIS, A. F. MURISON,
NARRATIVES OF THE CONQUESTS IN IRELAND, NENNIUS,
NIMMO, E. OSLER, R. PEEL, T. PERCY, J. PINKERTON, G. R. PORTER,
PROCOPIUS, PTOLEMY, J. RHYS, E. W. ROBERTSON, W. ROBERTSON,
J. A. ROEBUCK, S. ROMILLY, LORD ROSEBERY, R. RUSH, T. RYMER,
SIMMEL, W. F. SKENE, G. SMITH, S. SMITH, R. SOUTHEY, J.
SPEED, E. SPENSER, J. SPOTTISWOODE, A. P. STANLEY, STATE
PAPERS OF HENRY VIII, A. STEWART, W. K. SULLIVAN,
TERTULLIAN, T. THOMPSON, T. TOOKE, T. F. TOUT, G. TUCKER, BISHOP
TURGOT, H. TWISS, WALLACE, S. WALPOLE, T. WALSINGHAM, J.
DE WAVRIN, R. WODROW, J. J. A. WORSAAE, A. WYNTOUN**



BOOK IV

THE HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY TO THE DEATH OF MACBETH

[80-1068 A.D.]

If we except the Athenians and the Jews, no people so few in number have scored so deep a mark in the world's history as you Scots have done.—J. A. FROUDE.^b

"THE name of Scotia, or Scotland, whether in its Latin or its Saxon form, was not applied to any part of the territory forming the modern kingdom of Scotland till towards the end of the tenth century," says Skene.^c "That part of the island of Britain which is situated to the north of the firths of Forth and Clyde seems indeed to have been known to the Romans as early as the first century by the distinctive name of Caledonia, and it also appears to have borne from an early period another appellation, the Celtic form of which was *Albu*, *Alba*, or *Alban*, and its Latin form *Albania*. The name of *Scotia*, however, was exclusively appropriated to the island of Ireland.'

"Ireland was emphatically *Scotia*, the *patria*, or mother country, of the *Scoti*. From the tenth to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries the name of *Scotia*, gradually superseding the older name of *Alban*, or *Albania*, was con-

[^a "*Scotus* is, in fact, simply the Latin name for Gael," says Sir J. H. Ramsay.^d J. Rhys,^e however, thinks that, as the Picts were so called by the Romans because they painted themselves (*picti*, compare our derivative, "picture"), so the name *Scotti* comes from the Roman retention of a Celtic word "*Scotti*," meaning carved or painted, i.e., tattooed or disfigured.]

fined to a district nearly corresponding with that of the Lowlands of Scotland which is situated on the north of the firth of Forth.

"The three propositions: (1) that Scotia, prior to the tenth century, was Ireland, and Ireland alone; (2) that when applied to Scotland it was considered a new name superinduced upon the older designation of Alban or Albania; and (3) that the Scotia of the three succeeding centuries was limited to the districts between the Forth, the Spey, and Drumalban, lie at the very threshold of Scottish history."

Before proceeding to discuss the early peoples of Scotland from a modern point of view, it will be interesting to quote a description of the land and people as they appeared to a contemporary of Mary Queen of Scots. This excerpt will also show wherein the Scotch-English of that time differed from the language of Shakespeare.^a

AN EARLY ACCOUNT OF LAND AND PEOPLE (BY LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE)

"Brittane or Brutane, which by tuo names is called Ingland and Scotland, is an illand in ocean sea, situat richt over against France; one pairt of which the Inglismen doe inhabite, and the other pairt Scottis; the third pairt Welschmen, and the fourth pairt Cornischmen. All they, aither in language, conditione, or lawis, doe differ amongst thamselffis.

"The ocean sea doeth bound Ingland. The rivar of Tweid divydeh Ingland and Scotland, north; Scotland, ane vther pairt of Brittain, begane sumtyme at the hill called Grampius, now called Granteshane, stretching to the farthest coast northward. Bot efter the overthrow of the Pickis, it begane at the river Tweid, and sumtyme at the river of Tyne; the fortoun of warres altering the same as it doeth all other thingis. Thairfoir the lenth of Scotland from Tweid to the farthest coast, is esteemed to be four hundreth auchtie myllis.

"Bot as Scotland is broader than Ingland, so it is longer and endeth lyk ane wedge; for the montane Grampius is evill favoured and craigie, which Tacitus' in the lyffe of Julius Agrecola, doeth remember, pearcing throw the bowels of Scotland from the coast to the Germane sea, that is to say, from the mouth of the river of Die, to the Irisch sea, evin to the Laik Lowmond, which lyeth betweine that countrie and that same hill. The river of Tweid which springeth furth of ane little hill, not far beyond Roxburgh, is mingled with the Germane ocean, joynand southward with that countrie which is called the Marches, being the cast boundis betuixt Scotland and Ingland.

"The breadth of the island is verie schort, for, falling into the form of ane wadge, it is scant thrithie mylles, over which defendeth with thrie promontories lyk toures, repelleth the great vaves and surges of the sea, invironed with tuo gulfes, which these promontories doe inclose. The entries be quyet and calme, and the watter peaceable. The strait of that land is at this day called Caithnes, coasting vpoun the sea Deucallidon. And this much of the particularis of Scotland. Bot the same is everie place full of guid heavines and navigable entressis, laikis with marsches, floodis, fountains verie full of fisches, and montanes, vpoun the topis quhair of be pleasant plaines, yielding great store of grase, and plentie of fodder for cattle, woodus also full of wyld beastis. That pairt of the land is verie weill sustained with commodities, and thairfoir the people hard to be vanquished at on tyme, be reasone of the woodis and marishes that be at hand, for refuge of hunger, eased with venisone and fisch.

"Without Scotland, in the Irisch seaes, ar many illandis now discovered,

[55-60 A.D.]

to the number of ane hundred and fourtie; sume of these ar in length threttie myllis, bot in breadth not above twelff mylles; amongst thame is Iona, beautified with the tomb of the Scottis kingis. The illanderis generallie speak Irisch, which declaireth thame to tak thair originall of the Irisch natione.

"Beyond Scotland, towardis the north, lie the illes of Orchades, which Ptolomie^o sayeth to be thriescoir in number; sum lying in the Deucalidone sea, and sum in the Germane Ocean. Beyond the Orchadis lie the illandis of Scotland, under the command of the king of Scottis, and beyond these standeth Thule, in the frozen sea, now called Iseland, to which our merchantis re-paire everie yeir for fisching, in the somer.

"And this much of the scite of Scotland; now of the nature and maneris of the people. The Scottis which inhabite in the southerne pairt be weill nurtured, and leive in guid civilitie, and the most civil vse the Inglisch speach; and for thair wode thair is geasone and scant; thair commoun fewell is of stones, which they dig out of the earth. The other pairt northerne, are full of montaines, and verie rud and homlie kynd of people doeth inhabite, which is called the Reidschankis, or wyld Scottis. They be cloathed with ane mantle, with ane schirt fashioned after the Irisch maner, going bair legged to the knie. Thair weapons are bowis and dartes, with ane verie broad sword, and ane dagger scharp onlie at the on syd. All speik Irisch, feiding vpoun fisches, milk, cheise, and flesches, and having great numberis of cattell. The Scottis differ from the Inglisch in lawes and customes, because they vse the civil law as almost all other countries do. The Inglisch have their awin lawis and edictis. In certane other conditiones thay be not far vnlyk. Both their languages is one, thair habite and complectione alyk: On courage in battle, and in the nobilitie on desir, and pregnancie in hunting. The countrie houssis be narrow, covered with strae and reid, quhairin the people and beastis doe lige togidder.

"Thair tounes, besydis St Johnstoun, ar vnwalled, which is to be ascryved to thair animositie and hardines, fixing all thair succouris and help in the valencie of thair bodies. The Scottis ar verie wyse, as thair learning declaireth, for to quhatsoever airt they doe apply thamselffis, they doe easilie proffeit in the same. Bot the idle and sloathfull, and such as doe shun and avoyd labour, seeme in gritt povertie, and yit will not stick to boast of thair gentilitie and noble birth, as thought it war more semlie for the honest to laik, than comlie by exercise of sum honest airt to gett thair liveing. Bot the Scottis be generallie devot observaris of religione. And this much of Scotland."

THE ROMANS IN SCOTLAND

The history of every modern European nation must commence with the decay of the Roman Empire. From the dissolution of that immense leviathan almost innumerable states took their rise, as the decay of animal matter only changes the form, without diminishing the sum, of animal life. Julius Cæsar had commenced the conquest of Britain in the year B.C. 55. The southern Britons were completely subjected to the yoke of Rome, and reduced to the condition of colonists, in the year of grace 80, by the victorious arms of Agricola.

This intelligent chief discovered, what had been before suspected, that the fine country the southern part of which he had thus conquered was an island, whose northern extremity, rough with mountains, woods, and inaccessible morasses, and peopled by tribes of barbarians who chiefly subsisted by the

chase, was washed by the northern ocean. To hear of a free people in his neighbourhood, and to take steps for their instant subjugation, was the principle on which every Roman general acted; and it was powerfully felt by Julius Agricola, father-in-law of the historian Tacitus,¹ who at this time commanded in South Britain. But many a fair and fertile region, of much more considerable extent, had the victors of the world subdued with far more speed and less loss than this rugged portion of the north was to cost them.

It was in the year 80 when Agricola set out from Manchester, then called Mancunium; and that and the next season of 81 were spent in subduing the tribes of Brigantes in the southern parts of what is now termed Scotland, and in forcing such natives as resisted across the estuaries of the Forth and the Clyde, driving them as it were into another island. It was not till 83 that the invaders could venture across the firth of Forth, and engage themselves among the marshes, lakes, and forests near Lochleven. Here Agricola, having divided his troops into three bodies, one of them, consisting of the ninth legion, was so suddenly attacked by the natives at a place called Loch Ore, that the Romans suffered much loss, and were only rescued by a forced march of Agricola to their support. In the summer of 84 Agricola passed northwards, having now reached the country of the Caledonians, or Men of the Woods, a fierce nation, or rather a confederacy of clans, towards whose country all such southern tribes and individuals as preferred death to servitude had retired before the progress of the invaders.

The Caledonians and their allies, commanded by a chief whom the Romans called Galgacus, faced the invaders bravely, and fought them manfully at a spot on the southern side of the Grampian Hills, but antiquaries are not agreed upon the precise field of action.¹ The Romans gained the so-called battle of the Grampians [or of Mons Granpius], but with so much loss that Agricola was compelled to postpone further operations by land, and he retreated to make sure of the territories he had overrun. The fleet sailed round the north of Scotland, and Agricola's campaigns terminated with this voyage of discovery. There was no prosecution of the war against the Caledonians after the departure of Agricola in 85. Much was however done for securing at least the southern part of that general's conquests; and it was then, doubtless, that were planned and executed those numerous forts, those extensive roads, those commanding stations, which astonish the antiquary to this day, when, reflecting how poor the country is even now, he considers how intense must have been the love of power, how excessive the national pride, which could induce the Romans to secure at an expense of so much labour these wild districts of mountain, moor, thicket, and marsh.

Nor, after all, were these conquests secured. The emperor Hadrian, in 120 A.D., was contented virtually to admit this fact by constructing an external line of defence against the fierce Caledonians, in form of a strong wall, reaching across the island from the Tyne to the Solway, far within the boundary of Agricola's conquest. In the reign of Antoninus another and more northern boundary wall was extended across the island, reaching from Cariden, close to Linlithgow on the firth of Forth, to the firth of Clyde. This ultimate bulwark [built by Lollius Urbicus] served to protect the country betwixt the estuaries, while the regions beyond them were virtually resigned to their native and independent proprietors.

Notwithstanding precautions, the strength of the Roman Empire failed

¹ Gordon¹ placed it at Dealgan Ross, near Comrie, Chalmers² at Ardoch, others in Fife, or in Kincardineshire, Skene³ at Cleavers Dyke, a peninsula where the Isla joins the Tay, and where there are remains of a large Roman camp.]

[170-446 A.D.]

to support her ambitious pretensions to sovereignty; and 170 A.D. the Romans, abandoning the more northern wall of Antonine, retired behind that erected under the auspices of the emperor Hadrian in 120. They doubtless retained possession of such forts and stations, of which there were many, as served the purpose of outworks to protect the southern rampart.

Under this enlargement of their territories, and awed by the Roman eagles, the Caledonians remained quiet till the beginning of the third century, when in the year 207 open war again broke out betwixt them and the Romans. In 208 the emperor Severus at the age of threescore undertook in person the final conquest of the Caledonians at the head of a very numerous army. He cut down forests, made roads through marshes and over mountains, and endeavoured to secure the districts which he overran. But the Caledonians, while they shunned a general action, carried on, with the best policy of a country assailed by a superior force, a destructive warfare on the flanks and rear of the invading army; and the labours of the Romans, with the fatigues and privations to which they were exposed, wasted them so much, that they are said by the historian Dion^k to have lost fifty thousand men, equal probably to more than half of their force. Severus, however, advanced as far as the Moray Firth, and noticed a length of days and shortness of nights unknown in the southern latitudes.

In this boreal region the emperor made a peace, illusory on the part of the barbarians, who surrendered some arms, and promised submission. Severus returned from his distant and destructive excursion, borne as usual in his litter at the head of his army, and sharing their hardships and privations. He had no sooner reached York on his return than he received information that the whole Caledonian tribes were again in arms. He issued orders for collecting his forces and invading the country anew, with the resolution to spare neither sex nor age, but totally to extirpate the natives of these wild regions, whose minds seemed as tameless as their climate or country. But death spared the emperor the guilt of so atrocious a campaign. Severus expired February, 211. His son restored to the Caledonians the territories which his father had overrun rather than subdued; and the wall of Antoninus, the more northern of the two ramparts, was once again tacitly recognised as the boundary of the Roman province and limit of the empire.

From this time the war in Britain was on the part of the Romans merely defensive, while on that of the free Britons' it became an incursive predatory course of hostilities, that was seldom intermitted. In this species of contest the colonised Britons, who had lost the art of fighting for themselves, were for some time defended by the swords of their conquerors.⁴ In 368, and again in 398, Roman succours were sent to Britain, and repressed successfully the fury of the barbarians. In 422 a legion was again sent to support the colonists; but, tired of the task of protecting them, the Romans, in 446, ostentatiously restored the Southern Britons to freedom, and exhorting them henceforth to look to their own defence, evacuated Britain for ever. The boast that Scotland's more remote regions were never conquered by the Romans is not a vain one; for the army of Severus invaded Caledonia, without subduing it, and even his extreme career stopped on the southern side of Moray Firth, and left the northern and western Highlands unassailed.^m

[^l In 360 the "Scots" first appear in history in the pages of Ammianus along with the "Picts." He records the descent of these tribes upon the Roman province at this time in words which imply that they had before passed the southern wall and states that the Scots four years later caused the Britons frequent anxiety.]

ROMAN RELICS IN BRITAIN

The Roman Empire in Britain left widely different results in the southern and in the northern portions of the island. The former became an organised, and in the centre of population a civilised province, in which Latin was spoken by the educated, the arts cultivated, Roman law administered, and Christianity introduced. The latter, with the partial exception of the district south of the wall of Antoninus, remained in the possession of barbarous heathen races, whose customs had altered little since Roman writers described them as similar to, though ruder than, those of the Celts in Gaul before its conquest. No Roman towns existed, and only one of two villas have been found north of York, and quite near to that place. The camp, the altar, the sepulchral monument, possibly a single temple (the mysterious Arthur's Oven or Julius's Hof on the Carron, now destroyed, but described by Boeceⁿ and Buchanan^o and figured by Camden^p), the stations along the wall, the roads with their milestones, a number of coins (chiefly prior to the second century), and a few traces of baths are the only vestiges of Roman occupation in this part of Britain. So completely had Britain passed beyond the serious attention of the emperor of the east that in the beginning of the sixth century Belisarius, Justinian's general, sarcastically offered it to the Goths in exchange for Sicily; while Procopius,^q the Byzantine historian, has nothing to tell of it except that a wall was built across it by the ancients, the direction of which he supposes to have been from north to south, separating the fruitful and populous east from the barren serpent-haunted western district, and the strange fable that its natives were excused from tribute to the kings of the Franks in return for the service of ferrying the souls of the dead from the mainland to the shores of Britain.

THE EARLIEST RACES IN SCOTLAND

It is to the Celts, the first known inhabitants of Britain, that our inquiry next turns. This people were not indigenous, but came by sea to Britain. A conjecture, not yet proved, identifies as inhabitants of Britain before the Celts a branch of the race now represented in Europe only by the Basques. Amongst many names of British tribes in Latin writers three occur, two with increasing frequency, as the empire drew near its close—Britons, Picts, and Scots—denoting distinct branches of the Celts. Britain was the Latin name for the larger island and Britons for its inhabitants; Albion, a more ancient title, has left traces in English poetry, and in the old name Alba or Albany for northern Scotland. The Britons in Roman times occupied, if not the whole island, at least as far north as the Forth and Clyde. Their language, British, called later Cymric, survives in modern Welsh and the Breton of Brittany. Cornish, which became extinct in the seventeenth century, was a dialect of the same speech. Its extent northwards is marked by the Cumbræ—the islands of Cymry in the Clyde—and Cumberland, a district originally stretching from the Clyde to the Mersey.

The Picts, a Latin name for the northern tribes who preserved longest the custom of painting their bodies, called themselves Cruithne. Their original settlements appear to have been in the Orkneys, the north of Scotland, and the northeast of Ireland—the modern counties of Antrim and Down. They spread in Scotland, before or shortly after the Romans left, as far south as the Pentland Hills, which, like the Pentland Firth, are thought to preserve their name, occupied Fife, and perhaps left a detachment in

[80-600 A.D.]

Galloway. Often crossing, probably sometimes using, the deserted wall of Hadrian, they caused it to acquire their name—a name of awe to the provincial Britons and their English conquerors. Their language, though Celtic, is still a problem difficult to solve, as so few words have been preserved. Its almost complete absorption in that of the Gaels or Scots suggests that it did not differ widely from theirs, and with this agrees the fact that Columba and his followers had little difficulty in preaching to them, though they sometimes required an interpreter. Some philologists believe it to have been more allied to Cymric, and even to the Cornish variety; but the proof is inconclusive.

The Scots came originally to Ireland, one of whose names, from the sixth to the thirteenth century, was *Scotia*; *Scotia Major* it was called after part of northern Britain in the eleventh century had acquired the same name. Irish traditions represent the Scots as Milesians from Spain. Their Celtic name *Gaidheal*, *Goidel*, or *Gael* appears more akin to that of the natives of Gaul. They had joined the Picts in their attack on the Roman province in the fourth century, and perhaps had already settlements in the west of Scotland; but the transfer of the name was due to the rise and progress of the tribe called *Dalriad*, which migrated from *Dalriada* in the north of Antrim to Argyll and the Isles in the beginning of the sixth century. Their language, *Gaidhelic*, was the ancient form of the Irish of Ireland and the Gaelic of the Scottish Highlanders. No clear conclusion has been reached as to the meaning of Briton, Cruithne, Scot, and Gael.

The order of the arrival of the three divisions of the Celtic race and the extent of the islands they occupied are uncertain. Bede^r in the beginning of the eighth century gives the most probable account.

"This island at the present time contains five nations, the Angles, Britons, Scots, Picts, and Latins, each in its own dialect cultivating one and the same sublime study of divine truth. The Latin tongue by the study of the Scriptures has become common to all the rest. At first this island had no other inhabitants but the Britons, from whom it derived its name, and who, carried over into Britain, as is reported, from *Armorica*, possessed themselves of the southern parts. When they had made themselves masters of the greatest part of the island, beginning at the south, the Picts from *Scythia*, as is reported, putting to sea in a few long ships, were driven by the winds beyond the shores of Britain, and arrived on the northern coast of Ireland, where, finding the nation of the Scots, they begged to be allowed to settle among them, but could not succeed in obtaining their request. The Scots answered that the island could not contain them both, but 'we can give you good advice what to do: we know there is another island not far from ours, to the east, which we often see at a distance, when the days are clear. If you go thither you will obtain a settlement; or, if any should oppose, you shall have our aid.' The Picts accordingly sailing over into Britain began to inhabit the northern part of the island. In process of time Britain, after the Britons and Picts, received a third nation, the Scots, who, migrating from Ireland under their leader *Renda*, either by fair means or force secured those settlements amongst the Picts which they still possess."

This statement in its main points (apart from the country from which the Picts are said to have come) is confirmed by Latin authors, in whose meagre notices the Picts appear before the Scots are mentioned, and both occur later than the Britons; by the legends of the three Celtic races; by the narratives of *Gildas*^s and *Nennius*,^t the only British Celtic historians, the *Irish Annals*,^u and the *Pictish Chronicle*.^v It is in harmony with the facts con-

[350-561 A.D.]

tained in the *Life of Columba*,¹ written in the seventh century, but based on an earlier life, by one of his successors, Cumine,² abbot of Iona, who may have seen Columba and must have known persons who had.

The northern Britain brought before us in connection with Columba in the latter half of the sixth century is peopled by Cruithne or Picts in the north and central Highlands, and by Scots in Argyll and the Isles; there is a British king ruling the southwest from the rock on the Clyde then known as Alcyth or Alclyde, now Dumbarton; and Saxony, under Northumbrian kings, is the name given to the district south of the Forth, including the eastern Lowlands, where by this time Angles had settled.¹ The scarcity of Celtic history belonging to Scotland indicates that its tribes were less civilised than their Irish and Welsh kin.

THE CONVERSION OF SCOTLAND: THE WORK OF ST. COLUMBA (563 A.D.)

It is in the records of the Christian church that we first touch historic ground after the Romans left. Although the legends of Christian superstition are almost as fabulous as those of heathen ignorance, we can follow with reasonable certainty the conversion of the Scottish Celts. Three Celtic saints venerated throughout Scottish history—Ninian, Kentigern, Columba—Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, David, the patron saint of Wales, and Cuthbert, the apostle of Lothian and patron saint of Durham, belonging to the Celtic church, though probably not a Celt, mark the common advance of the Celtic races from heathenism to Christianity between the end of the fourth and the end of the sixth century. The conversion of Scotland in the time of Pope Victor I in the second century is unhistoric, and the legend of St. Rule (*Regulus*) having brought the relics of St. Andrew in the reign of Constantius from Achaia to St. Andrews, where the Pictish king built a church and endowed lands in his honour, is, if historical at all, antedated by some centuries. There is no proof that amongst the places which the Romans had not reached, but which had accepted Christianity when Tertullian wrote, there was any part of modern Scotland; but, as Christian bishops from Britain without fixed locality begin to appear in the fourth century, possibly the first converts in Scotland had been made before its close.

Scotland gave Patrick to Ireland, and Ireland returned the gift in Columba.¹ A rare good fortune has preserved in Adamnan's *Life*² the tradition of the acts of the greatest Celtic saint of Scotland, and a picture of the monastic Celtic church in the sixth and seventh centuries—an almost solitary fragment of history between the last of the Roman and the first of the Anglo-Saxon historians. Born in 521 at Gartan in Donegal, Columba spent his youth at Moville under Abbot Finian, called the foster-father of the Irish saints from the number of his disciples. Here he was ordained deacon, and, after completing his education, received priest's orders. In 561 he took part in the battle of Culdrevny (in Connaught), when the chiefs of the Hui Neill (Dalriad Scots), his kindred, defeated Diarmid (*Diarmait*), a king of eastern Ireland. Excommunicated by the synod for his share in the battle—according to one account fought at his instance—and moved by missionary

[¹ So Skene² notes "the four kingdoms" of that early period: First, the Scottish Dalriada; second, the kingdom of the Picts; third, the Britons of Strathclyde or Alclyde; fourth, the Angles of Bernicia.]

[² Scottish history may be emphatically said to begin with Columba's landing in Iona about the year 563. By the great work he achieved Columba fairly takes his place with the founders of nations, who have a niche apart in the annals of mankind.—HUME BROWN.²]

[563-597 A.D.]

seal, he crossed two years afterwards the narrow sea which separates Antrim from Argyll with twelve companions and founded the monastery of Iona, on the little island to the west of Mull, given him by his kinsman Conall.

The Dalriad Scots, who had settled in the western islands of Scotland and in Lorne early in the sixth century, were already Christians; but Columba soon after visited the Pictish king Brude, the son of Mailochon, whom he converted, and from whom he received a confirmation of Conall's grant.

He frequently revisited Ireland and took part in its wars; the militant spirit is strongly marked in his character; but most of his time was devoted to the administration of his monastery of Iona, and to the planting of other churches and religious houses in the neighbouring isles and mainland, till his death in 597. The most celebrated of his disciples were Baithene, his successor as abbot; Machar, to whom the church of Aberdeen traces its origin; Cormac, the navigator, the first missionary to the Orkneys, who perhaps reached the Faroes and Iceland; and Drostan, the founder of the Scottish monastery of Deer.

The character of the Celtic church of Columba was, like its mother church in Ireland, modified by migration to a country only in small part Christian. It was a missionary church, not diocesan but monastic, with an abbot who was a presbyter, not a bishop, for its head.

It was a form of Christianity fitted to excite the wonder and gain the affection of the heathen amongst whom the monks came, practising as well as preaching the self-denying doctrine of the cross. The religion of the Celts is a shadowy outline on the page of history. Notices of idols are rare. They had not the art necessary for an ideal representation of the human form, though they learned to decorate the rude stone monuments of an earlier age with elaborate tracery. They had no temples. The mysterious circles of massive stones, with no covering but the heavens, may have served for places of worship, as well as memorials of the more illustrious dead. The names of gods are conspicuously absent, though antiquaries trace the worship of the sun in the Beltane fires and other rites; but in the account of their adversaries we read of demons whom they invoked. Divination by rods or twigs, incantations or spells, strange rites connected with the elements of water and of fire, "choice of weather, lucky times, the watching of the voice of birds," are mentioned as amongst the practices of the Druids, a priestly caste revered for superior learning and, if we may accept Caesar^{bb} as an authority, highly educated. This, rather than fetish or animal worship, appears to have been their cult.

Whatever its precise form, this religion made a feeble resistance to the Christian, taught by the monks, with learning drawn from Scripture and some acquaintance with Latin as well as Christian literature, and enforced by the example of a pure life and the hope of a future world. The charms of music and poetry, in which the Celt delighted, were turned to sacred use. Columba was a protector of the bards, himself a bard.

It is not with the "screod" our destiny is,
Nor with the bird on the top of the twig,
Nor with the trunk of a knotted tree,
Nor with a "seadan" hand in hand.

I adore not the voice of birds,
Nor the "screod" nor destiny nor lots in this world,
Nor a son nor chance nor woman;
My Druid is Christ, the Son of God,
Christ, Son of Mary, the Great Abbot,
The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

[597-642 A.D.]

Adamnan^u relates miracles of Columba scarcely above the level of the practices of the Druids. But superstition is not vanquished by superstition. Celibacy was a protest against the promiscuous intercourse for which Christian fathers condemn the Celts. Fasts and vigils contrasted with the gross, perhaps cannibal, practices still in use. The intense faith in Christ of lives such as Patrick's and Columba's won the victory of the Cross.

STRATHCLYDE, DALRIADA, AND CONFLICTS WITH THE FUTURE ENGLAND

When we pass to civil history our knowledge is restricted to a list of names and battles; but the labours of recent scholars allow a brief account of the Celtic races from the end of the sixth to their union in the middle of the ninth century, in part hypothetical, yet a great advance on the absolute blank which made historians of the eighteenth century decline the task in despair.

The Britons, whose chief king had ruled at Alclyde, were separated from their fellow countrymen, the Cymry in Wales, shortly after Columba's death by the rapid advance of the Anglian kingdom of Northumberland, founded in the middle of the sixth century by Ida of Bamborough. One of his successors, Æthelfrith, struck the blow, completed by the wars of the next king, Eadwin, which severed modern Wales from British Cumbria and Strathclyde. Even Mona, the holy isle of both heathen and Christian Britons, became Anglesea, the island of the Angles. A later incursion towards the end of the century reached Carlisle and separated the kingdom of Alclyde from English Cumbria, and reduced for a short time Strathclyde to a subject province. The decline of the Northumbrian kingdom in the eighth century enabled the kings of Strathclyde to reassert their independence and maintain their rule within a restricted district more nearly answering to the valley of the Clyde, and in Galloway, in which there are some faint indications of a Pictish population, till it was united to the kingdom of Scone by the election of Donald, brother of Constantine II, king of the Scots, to its throne.

Of the Scots of Dalriada somewhat more is known. Their history is interwoven with that of the Picts and meets at many points that of the Angles of Northumberland, who during the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, when their kings were the greatest in Britain, endeavoured to push their boundaries beyond the Forth and the Clyde. The history of this kingdom forms part of that of Scotland during these centuries. It planted in Lothian the seed from which the civilisation of Scotland grew. To an early period of the contest between the Angles and the Britons, and to the country between the Forth and Tweed and Solway, perhaps belong the battles magnified by successive poets who celebrated the hero of British mediæval romance. Whether these battles were really fought in southern Scotland and on the borders, and Arthur's Seat was one of his strongholds, still "unknown is the grave of Arthur."

Before Eadwin's death (633) his kingdom extended to the Forth, and the future capital of Scotland received the name of Eadwinsburgh from him in place of the Mynyd Agned and Dunedin of the British and Gaelic Celts. During the reign of Oswald (635-642) the Northumbrians were reconverted by Aidan. Oswald's brother Oswy extended the dominion of Northumberland over a portion of the country of the northern Picts beyond the Forth. In his reign lived Cuthbert, the apostle of Lothian. His name is preserved in St. Cuthbert's church at Edinburgh and in Kirkcudbright. To the same period belong two inscriptions, the earliest records of Anglian speech, one on the

[855-900 A.D.]

cross of Bewcastle in Cumberland, commemorating Alfred, a son of Oswy; the other, taken perhaps from a poem of Caedmon, at Ruthwell in Dumfries.

Neither the Tweed nor the Solway was at this period a line of division. Oswy was succeeded by his son Egfrid (685), against whom the Picts successfully rebelled; and the Scots and a considerable part of the Britons also recovered their freedom. Anglian bishops, however, continued to hold the see of Whithorn during the whole of the eighth century. The Northumbrian kings, more successful in the west than in the east, gradually advanced from Carlisle along the coast of Ayr, and even took Alclyde. In what is now England their power declined from the middle of the eighth century before the rise of Mercia. Shortly before the commencement of the ninth century the descents of the Danes began, which led to the conflict for England between them and the Saxons of Wessex. The success of the latter under Alfred and his descendants transferred the supremacy to the princes of the southern kingdom, who, gradually advancing northwards, before the close of that century united all England under their sceptre.

Before its fall Northumberland produced three great men, the founders of English literature and learning, though two of them wrote chiefly in Latin—Caedmon, the monk of Whitby, the first English poet; Bede, the monk of Jarrow, the first English historian; and Alcuin, the monk of York, whose school might have become the first English university, had he not lived in the decline of Northumbrian greatness and been attracted to the court of Charlemagne. It is to this early dawn of talent among the Angles of Northumberland that England owes its name of the land of the Angles and its language that of English. The northern dialect spoken by the Angles was the speech of Lothian, north as well as south (in Northumberland) of the Tweed, and was preserved in the broad Scotch of the Lowlands, while modern English was formed from the southern dialect of Alfred, Chaucer, and Wycliffe.

This early Teutonic civilisation of the lowland district of Scotland, in spite of the Danish wars, the Celtic conquest, and border feuds, never died out, and it became at a later time the centre from which the Anglo-Saxon character permeated the whole of Scotland, without suppressing, as in England, the Celtic. Their union, more or less complete in different districts, is, after the difference in the extent of the Roman conquest, the second main fact of Scottish history, distinguishing it from that of England. Both, to a great degree, were the result of physical geography. The mountains and arms of the sea repelled invaders and preserved longer the ancient race and its customs.



OLD CASTLE IN DUNDI

EARLY PICTISH KINGS: BRUDE (706 A.D.) TO ANGUS MC FERGUS (731-761 A.D.)

It is necessary, before tracing the causes which led to the union of races in Scotland, to form some notion of northern Scotland during the century preceding Kenneth Macalpine, during which—the light of Adamnan^w and Bede^r being withdrawn—we are left to the guidance of the *Pictish Chronicle*^v and the *Irish Annals*.^u The Picts whom Columba converted appear to have been consolidated under a single monarch. Brude, the son of Mailochon, ruled from Inverness to Iona on the west and on the north to the Orkneys. A sub-king or chief from these islands appears at his court.

Although there exists a complete list of the Pictish kings from Brude, son of Mailochon, to Brude, son of Ferat, conquered by Kenneth Macalpine, and of the Scots of Dalriada from Aidan (converted by Columba) to Kenneth Macalpine, with their regnal years, it is only here and there that a figure emerges sufficiently distinct to enter history. Parts of these lists are fictitious and others doubtful, nor do we know over what extent of country the various monarchs ruled. Of the figures more or less prominent amongst the Pictish kings are Brude, the son of Derili, the contemporary of Adamnan,^w who died in 706, being then styled king of Fortren. Nechtan, another son of Derili, was the contemporary of Bede,^r who gives (710) the letter of Ceolfrid, abbot of Wearmouth, to him when he adopted the Roman Easter and the tonsure. Six years later Nechtan expelled the Columbite monks from his dominions. They retired to Dalriada, as their brethren in Northumberland had done when a similar change was made by Oswy. Nechtan also asked for masons to build a church in the Roman style, to be dedicated to St. Peter, and several churches in honour of that apostle were founded within his territory. Shortly after, Egbert, an Anglian monk, persuaded the community of Hy (Iona) itself to conform, but too late to lead to the union of the churches of the Scots and the Picts, which were separated also by political causes.

Fifteen years later the greatest Pictish monarch, Angus MacFergus, after a contest with more than one rival gained the supremacy, which he held for thirty years (731-761). In revenge for the capture of his son Brude by Dungal, son of Selvach, king of the Dalriad Scots, he attacked Argyll, and laid waste the whole country, and put in chains the sons of Selvach. He next conquered (739), and it is said drowned, Talorgan, son of Drostan, king of Athole, one of his rivals, and resuming the Dalriad war, reduced the whole of the western Highlands. The Britons of Strathclyde were assailed by a brother of Angus, who fell in battle; and Angus, with his ally Eadbert, king of the Northumberland, retaliated by burning Alclyde (756). About this time (752) Coilin Droighteach (the Bridgemaker), abbot of Iona, removed most of the relics of his abbey to Ireland, and this is the most probable date of the legend of the relics of St. Andrew being brought from Patras to St. Andrews, where the sons of a Pictish king, Hungus (Angus MacFergus), who was absent in Argyll, or, according to another version, Hungus himself, dedicated Kilrighmont (St. Andrews) and the district called the Boar's Chase to St. Andrew. The ascription of the foundation to an earlier king of the same name in the fourth century was due to the wish to give the chief bishopric of Scotland an antiquity greater than Iona and Glasgow, greater even than Canterbury and York.

After the death of Angus MacFergus no king is connected with any event of importance except Constantine, son of Fergus (died 820), who is said to have founded the church of Dunkeld—226 years after Garnard, son of Donald, founded Abernethy. This fact, though the earlier date is not certain, points

[803-860 A.D.]

to the Perthshire lowlands as having been for a long time the centre of the chief Pictish monarchy.

Probably Scone was during this period, as it certainly became afterwards, the political capital; and the kings latterly are sometimes called kings of Fortren. If so, the chief monarchy under the pressure of the Norse attacks had passed south from Inverness, but it is not possible to say whether there may not have continued to be independent Pictish rulers in the north.

The annals of Dalriada are even more perplexing than those of the Picts after the middle of the sixth century. There is the usual list of kings, but they are too numerous, and their reigns are calculated on an artificial system. The forty kings from Fergus MacEarc to Fergus MacFerchard, who would carry the date of the Scottish settlement back to three centuries at least before the birth of Christ, have been driven from the pale of history by modern criticism. The date of the true settlement was that of the later Fergus, the son of Earc, in 503. From that date down to Selvach, the king who was conquered by Angus MacFergus about 730, the names of the kings can be given with reasonable certainty from Adamnan,^w Bede,^r and the *Irish Annals*.^{*} But the subsequent names in the Scottish chronicles are untrustworthy, and it is an ingenious conjecture that some may have been inserted to cover the century following 730, during which Dalriada is supposed to have continued under Pictish rule. This view is not free from its own difficulties.

PICTS AND SCOTS UNITED BY KENNETH MACALPINE (844-860 A.D.) THE NORSE INVASIONS (787-872 A.D.)

Whatever may be the solution ultimately reached as to Kenneth Macalpine's antecedents, his accession represents a revolution which led by degrees to a complete union of the Picts and Scots and the establishment of one kingdom—at first called Albania and afterwards Scotia—which included all Scotland north of the Forth and Clyde, except Caithness, Sutherland, Orkney and Shetland (the northern isles or Nordreyar), the Hebrides (the southern isles or Sudreyar), and Man; these fell for a time into the hands of the Northmen. This revolution had two causes or concomitants, one religious and the other political. Kenneth Macalpine in the seventh year of his reign (851) brought the relics of St. Columba from Iona to a church he built at Dunkeld, and on his death he was buried at Iona.

A little earlier the Irish Culdees [or Keledei], then in their first vigour, received their earliest grant in Scotland at Loch Leven from Brude, one of the last kings of the Picts, and soon found their way into all the principal Columbite monasteries, of which they represent a reform. The Irish monastic system did not yet give place to the Roman form of diocesan episcopacy. The abbot of Dunkeld succeeded to the position of the abbot of Iona, and held it until the beginning of the tenth century, giving ecclesiastical sanction to the sovereign at Scone, as Columba had done in the case of Aidan.

As early as the beginning of the eighth century, however, a Pictish bishop of Scotland appears at a council of Rome, and he had at least two successors as sole bishops or primates of the Celtic church before dioceses were formed. Scotland north of the firths thus remained at a lower stage of church organisation than England, where a complete system of dioceses had been established, in great part answering to the original Anglo-Saxon kingdoms or their divisions, with Canterbury and York at their head as rivals for the primacy. But the Celtic clergy who now conformed to the Roman ritual preserved some knowledge of the Latin language, and a connection with Rome as the

[787-872 A.D.]

centre of Latin Christianity, which was certain to result in the adoption of the form of the church government now almost universal.

The other circumstances which had a powerful influence on the foundation of the monarchy of Scone and the consolidation of the Celtic tribes was the descent on all the coasts of Britain and Ireland of the Norse and Danish vikings. The Danes chiefly attacked England from Northumberland and along the whole east and part of the southern seaboard; the Norsemen attacked Scotland, especially the islands and the north and west coasts, going as far south as the Isle of Man and the east and south of Ireland.

It had now become essential to the existence of a Scottish Celtic kingdom that its centre should be removed farther inland. Argyll and the isles, including Iona, were in the path of danger. No monk would now have chosen



DRYBURGH ABBEY

One of the earliest Abbeys founded in Scotland

island homes for safety. In 787 the first arrival of the viking ships is noticed in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.^{cc} Some years later the *Irish Annals*^u mention that all "the islands of Britain were wasted and much harassed by the Danes." Iona was thrice plundered between 802 and 826. A poem composed not long after the event states that the shrine of Columba was one of the objects in search of which the Northmen came, and that it was concealed by the monks. It was to preserve the relics from this fate that some of them were transferred by Droigthead, the last abbot to Ireland and others by Kenneth to Dunkeld. For half a century the vikings were content with plunder, but in the middle of the ninth century they began to form settlements. In 849 Olaf the White established himself at Dublin as king of Hy Ivar; in 867 a Danish kingdom was set up in Northumberland; and Harold the Fairhaired, who in 872 became sole king of Norway, soon after led an expedition against the vikings, who had already seized Orkney and Shetland, and established an earldom under Rognwald, earl of Moeri, whose son Hrolf the Ganger conquered Normandy in the beginning of the next century.

The position of Scotland therefore, when Kenneth united the Picts and Scots was this: central Scotland from sea to sea—Argyll and the isles, Perth-

[844-877 A.D.]

shire, Angus and Mearns, and Fife—was under the dominion of the king who had Scone for his capital; the southwest district—the valley of the Clyde, Ayr, Dumfries, and Galloway—was under a British king at Dumbarton; the southeast district or Lothian was part of “Saxon” or “Sassenach Land”—the general Celtic name for the country of the Anglo-Saxons, but now owing to the divided state of Northumberland held by different lords; the north of Scotland was under independent Celtic chiefs, as Moray and Mar, or already occupied by Norsemen, as Caithness, Orkney and Shetland, and the Hebrides. The whole Celtic population was Christian, but the Norse invaders were still heathen.

The Norsemen both at home and in their colonies in Scotland embraced Christianity under Olaf Tryggvason in the end of the tenth century; but along with Christianity they retained the old heathen sentiments and customs, which, like their language, mingled with and modified the Celtic character on the western but far more on the northern coasts and islands, where the population was largely Norse. A strain neither Celtic nor Teutonic nor Norman occasionally meets us in Scottish history: it is derived from the blood or memory of the Norse vikings.

GROWTH OF THE CELTIC KINGDOM OF SCONE

During this period, though the Celtic annals are still obscure, we can trace the united Celtic kingdom growing on all sides under Kenneth's successors—southward by the conquest of Lothian on the east and by the union of the Strathclyde kingdom on the west, and for a time by holding English Cumbria under the English kings, and northward by the gradual incorporation of Angus, Mearns, Moray, and possibly the southern district of Aberdeen. Kenneth Macalpine's reign of sixteen years (844-860) was a time of incessant war. He invaded Saxony (Lothian) six times, burned Dunbar, and seized Melrose (already a rich abbey, though on a different site from the Cistercian foundation of David I), while the Britons (of Strathclyde) burned Dunblane, and the Danes wasted the land of the Picts as far as Cluny and Dunkeld. After they left Kenneth rebuilt the church of Dunkeld and replaced in it Columba's relics. He died at Forteviot and was buried at Iona.

He was succeeded by his brother Donald I (861-863), who with his people the Gaels, established the laws of Aidan [or Aed], son of Eachdach, at Forteviot. Aidan was a Dalriad king of the eighth century; but the contents of his laws are unknown. Perhaps “Tanistry,” by which the successor to the king was elected during his life from the eldest and worthiest of his kin, usually a collateral in preference to a descendant, was one feature, for it certainly prevailed amongst the Irish and Scottish Gaels. The next king, who succeeded in accordance with that custom, was Constantine I (863-877), son of Kenneth. His reign was occupied with conflicts with the Norsemen. Olaf the White, the Norse king of Dublin, laid waste the country of the Picts and Britons year after year, and in 870 reduced Alclyde, the British capital; but, as he disappears from history, he probably fell in a subsequent raid. He is said to have married a daughter of Kenneth, and some claim in her right may account for his Scottish wars. In the south the Danish leader Halfdan devastated Northumberland and Galloway; while in the north Thorsten the “Red,” a Norse viking of the Hebrides, who afterwards went to Iceland and figures in the sagas, conquered the coast of Caithness and Sutherland as far as Ekkial Bakki (the *Oikel*). But he was killed in the following year.

Constantine met with the same fate at a battle at Inverdovat in Fife in

[900-908 A.D.]

877, at the hands of another band of northern marauders. His death led to a disputed succession. His heir, according to the custom of tanistry, was his brother Aodh, who was killed by his own people after a year. Eocha, the son of Run, a king of the Britons, claimed in right of his mother, a daughter of Kenneth, according to the Pictish law, and governed at first along with Ciric or Grig, his tutor; then Grig ruled alone, until they were both expelled from the kingdom, and Donald II, son of Constantine, came to the throne (889). The *Pictish Chronicle* reports that during the government of Grig the Scottish church was freed from subjection to the laws of the Picts (meaning probably from liability to secular service). Grig is also said to have subdued all Bernicia and "almost Anglia," a statement which if confined to the north of the Northumbrian kingdom is not improbable, for it had then fallen into anarchy through the attacks of the Danes. The church of Ecclesgreig near Montrose possibly commemorates Grig and indicates the northward extension of the monarchy of Scone. In the reign of Donald II (889-900) son of Constantine I, Scotland was again attacked by the Norsemen. Sigurd, the Norse earl of Orkney, seized Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, and part of Moray, where he built the fort of Burghead, between the Findhorn and the Spey. Farther south the Danes took Dunnottar, where Donald was slain.

After his time the name of the kingdom of Scone was no longer Pictavia, but Albania [Alban] or Alba, a more ancient title of northern Scotland, perhaps resumed to mark the growth of the Scottish-Pictish monarchy in the central and eastern Highlands.

THE KINGDOM OF ALBA: CONSTANTINE II, THE FIRST GREAT SCOTTISH KING
(900-940 A.D.)

Donald II was followed by Constantine II (900-940), son of Aodh and grandson of Kenneth, and his long reign is a proof of his power. He was the greatest Scottish king, as Angus MacFergus had been the greatest of the pure Pictish race. In the first part of his reign his kingdom was still beset by the Norsemen. In his eighth year Rognwald, the Danish king of Dublin, ravaged Dunblane. Six years later the same leader was defeated on the Tyne (? in East Lothian) by Constantine. Rognwald escaped and reappears some years later as king of Northumberland. This is a battle whose site and incidents are told in a conflicting manner by different chronicles; but it appears certain that Constantine saved his dominions from further serious attacks by the vikings. He had now to meet a more formidable foe—the west Saxons, whose kings, the descendants of Alfred, were steadily moving northwards.

In spite of his wars, Constantine found time in the early part of his reign for two important reforms—one ecclesiastical, the other civil. In his sixth year (906) he, along with Cellah, bishop of St. Andrew's—the first of twelve Celtic bishops of Scotland—swore on the Hill of Faith at Scone (906) that "the laws and discipline of the faith, and the rights of the churches and the gospel, should be preserved on an equal footing with the Scots." This obscure notice of the *Pictish Chronicle* indicates the establishment or restoration of the Scottish church, which the Pictish kings had oppressed, to an equality with that of the Pictish. As a sign of the union the crozier of St. Columba, called Cathbuadth ("victory in battle") was borne before Constantine's armies. Two years later, on the death of Donald king of the Britons of Strathclyde, Constantine procured the election of his own brother Donald to that kingdom.

[904-954 A.D.]

Though he thus strengthened church and state, Alfred's successors were too powerful for him. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*^{cc} records of Eadward the Elder, that in 924, having built a fort at Bakewell, in the Peak of Derbyshire, "the king and nation of the Scots, Rognwald the Northumbrian and others, and also the king of the Strathclyde Welsh and his people, chose him for father and lord."¹ His son Athelstan is related by the same authority to have subjugated all the kings in the island, amongst whom are mentioned by name Howell king of the west Welsh, Constantine king of the Scots, Owen king of Gwent, and Eldred of Bamborough, who "made peace with oaths at Emmet and renounced every kind of idolatry." These entries are not beyond suspicion. The Peak was a distant point for the Scottish king. Rognwald, the Northumbrian, died in 920, according to the *Irish Annals*;⁴ Howell and Constantine were already Christians and could not have then renounced idolatry. If there is any truth in the submission of the Scots to Edward the Elder it did not last, for some years later the *Chronicle* states that Athelstan went into Scotland with a land and sea force and ravaged a great part of it. A league of the northern kings against Athelstan was dispersed (937) by his great victory at Brunanburh (? Wendun, between Aldborough and Knaresborough, according to Skene^c). The forces allied against him were those of Constantine, his son-in-law Olaf, son of Sitric (called also the Red) and another Olaf, son of Godfrey, from Ireland, besides the Strathclyde and north Welsh kings. For Athelstan there fought, in addition to his own west Saxons, the Mercians and some mercenaries from Norway, amongst them Egil, son of Sklagrim, the hero of a famous Icelandic saga.

No greater slaughter had been known since the Anglo-Saxons, "proud war-smiths," as their poet calls them, overcame the Welsh and gained England. A son of Constantine was slain, four kings, and seven earls. Constantine himself escaped to Scotland, where in old age he resigned the crown for the tonsure and became abbot of the Culdees of St. Andrews. Athelstan died two years after Brunanburh, but before his death granted Northumberland to Eric Bloody-Axe, son of Harold Haarfagr, who was almost immediately expelled by the Irish Danes. Athelstan, even after so great a victory, could not annex Northumberland, much less Scotland, to his dominions.

FROM MALCOLM I TO MALCOLM II (943-1034 A.D.)

Constantine's successor, Malcolm I (943-954), son of Donald II, began his reign by invading Moray and killing Cellah, its chief king. Meantime the Danish kings of Dublin had been endeavouring to maintain their hold on Northumberland with the aid of the Cumbrians, whose country they had already settled, and in this attempt the two Olafs had a temporary success; but Eadmund, the successor of Athelstan, expelled Olaf, son of Sitric, from Northumberland, and in the following year, to prevent the Cumbrians from again aiding the Danes, he "harried Cumberland and gave it all up to Malcolm, king of Scots, on condition that he should be his fellow-worker both on sea

[¹ "The question of the independence of Scotland, and the bearing of these passages upon it, has been very ably discussed on the English side by Freeman⁴; and on the Scottish side by Robertson^{aa}. It is unnecessary here to do more than refer to this discussion, and to add the opinion that Mr. Freeman has failed on the whole successfully to meet Mr. Robertson's criticism. Mr. Robertson was not the first to see the fatal objection to the statement in the *Saxon Chronicle*^{cc} that Rognwald, king of Northumbria, took Eadward for his father and lord in 924, while he died in 921. Florence^{ff} of Worcester saw it before him, and places the event under the year 921."—W. F. SKENE.^c Robertson's argument will be found in part in the next chapter.]

[954-1004 A.D.]

and land." This was the same policy which led his father to call in the aid of Eric Bloody-Axe. The kings of Wessex wisely granted what they could not hold to the best northern warrior, Celt or Scandinavian, under conditions which acknowledged more or less strictly their supremacy. Malcolm died fighting either against the men of Mearns or of Moray. Three kings followed (954-971)—Indulf, son of Constantine, Duff, son of Malcolm, Colin, son of Indulf; in the reign of Indulf the Northumbrians evacuated Edinburgh, which thenceforward was Scottish ground. A Saxon burgh, a fort, perhaps a town, was now for the first time within the Celtic kingdom.

Kenneth II (971-995), son of Malcolm, soon after his accession made a raid on Northumberland as far south as Cleveland. Kenneth II (971-995) was followed, as he had been preceded, by insignificant kings—Constantine, son of Colin, and Kenneth, son of Duff. His son, Malcolm II (1005-1034), gained the throne by the slaughter of his predecessor Duff at Monzievaird, and at once turned his arms southwards; but his first attempt to conquer northern Northumberland was repelled. About the same time Sigurd, earl of Orkney, having defeated Finlay, mormaer of Moray, became ruler, according to the Norse saga, of "Ross and Moray, Sutherland, and the dales" of Caithness. He had conflicts with other Scottish chiefs, but appears to have made terms with the kings of both Norway and Scotland—with Olaf Tryggvason by becoming Christian and with Malcolm by marrying his daughter.

He fell at Clontarf (1014), the memorable battle near Dublin, by which Brian Boru and his son Murcadh defeated the Danish kings in Ireland and restored a Celtic dynasty. While the Celts of Ireland were thus expelling the Danish invaders and in Scotland there was divided possession, the result of compromise and of intermarriage, England fell under the dominion of the Danish kings Sweyn and Canute. Profiting by the distracted state of northern England, Malcolm again invaded Northumberland with Owen of Cumbria, called the Bald, and by the victory of Carham (1018) near Coldstream won Lothian, which remained from that time an integral part of Scotland. Canute, on his return from a pilgrimage to Rome, is said by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to have gone to Scotland, where Malcolm and two other kings Maelbeth and Jehmarc, submitted to him, but he held Scotland for only a little while. Maelbeth is supposed to be Macbeth, then mormaer of Moray, afterwards king, and Jehmarc, a Celtic or Scandinavian chief in Argyll.

The hold which Canute, who was trying to grasp Norway and Denmark as well as England, had upon northern Britain must have been slender as well as short; but the acknowledgment of the supremacy of so great a king was natural. At his death his overgrown empire fell to pieces, and Scotland was left to itself.

THE NAME SCOTIA COMES INTO USE (1004 A.D.)

Two years before, Malcolm II died. His conquest of Lothian perhaps led to the new name of Scotia (now generally applied to his kingdom), which was to become its permanent name. The Scotland he governed still had its centre at Scone, but the Norse earl, Thorfinn, at this time held the Orkneys, Caithness, Sutherland, and the Hebrides. After Owen the Bald, who fought at Carham, the next king mentioned is Duncan, son of the grandson and the successor of Malcolm. Malcolm II was liberal to the church, as we know from his gifts to the church of Deer. The laws attributed to him are spurious, introducing into the Celtic kingdom a fully developed feudalism which was not known in England, still less in Scotland, till after the Conquest. As he

[1034-1040 A.D.]

left no male heir, Malcolm's death led to a doubtful succession and a perplexed period of Scottish history.

Malcolm II was succeeded by his grandson Duncan (1034-1040) son of his daughter Bethoc and Crinan, a lay or secular abbot of Dunkeld; but his right was probably from the first contested by Thorfinn, who had become the most powerful of the Norse earls. If the Orkney saga could be relied upon, he had as many as eleven earls or mormaers subject to him, and a modern but unsafe interpretation of one passage extends his dominion as far as Galloway. Duncan, after an unsuccessful attempt on Durham, turned his arms to the north to check the further advance of his kinsman, but was defeated on the Pentland Firth. Moddan, whom he had tried to set up as earl of Caithness, was burned in his own house, and Duncan himself was killed at Bothgownan near Elgin by Macbeth, his own general."

DUNCAN AND MACBETH

Malcolm died peaceably in 1034, and was succeeded by "the gracious Duncan," the same who fell by the poniard of Macbeth. On reading these names every reader must feel as if brought from darkness into the blaze of noonday; so familiar are we with the personages whom we last named, and so clearly and distinctly we recall the events in which they are interested, in comparison with any doubtful and misty views which we can form of the twilight times before and after that fortunate period. But we must not be blinded by our poetical enthusiasm, nor add more than due importance to legends because they have been woven into the most striking tale of ambition and remorse that ever struck awe into a human bosom. The genius of Shakespeare having found the tale of Macbeth, adorned it with a lustre similar to that with which a level beam of the sun often invests some fragment of glass, which, though shining at a distance with the lustre of a diamond, is by a near investigation discovered to be of no worth or estimation.

The lady of Macbeth, whose real name was Gruoch, had deadly injuries to avenge on the reigning prince. She was the granddaughter of Kenneth IV, killed in 1003, fighting against Malcolm II; and other causes for revenge animated the mind of her who has been since painted as the sternest of women. The old annalists add some instigations of a supernatural kind to the influence of a vindictive woman over an ambitious husband. Three women, of more than human stature and beauty, appeared to Macbeth in a dream or vision, and hailed him successively by the titles of thane of Cromarty, thane of Moray, which the king afterwards bestowed on him, and finally by that of king of Scots: this dream, it is said, inspired him with the seductive hopes so well expressed in the drama.

Macbeth broke no law of hospitality in his attempt on Duncan's life. He attacked and slew the king at a place called Bothgownan, or the Smith's House, near Elgin, in 1040, and not, as has been supposed, in his own castle of Inverness. The act was bloody, as was the complexion of the times; but, in very truth, the claim of Macbeth to the throne, according to the rule of Scottish succession, was better than that of Duncan. As a king, the tyrant so much exclaimed against was, in reality, a firm, just, and equitable prince.

Very slight observation will enable us to recollect how much this simple statement differs from that of the drama, though the plot of the latter is consistent enough with the inaccurate historians from whom Shakespeare drew his materials. It might be added, that early authorities show us no such persons as Bantquo and his son Fleance, nor have we reason to think that the

[1034-1040 A.D.]

latter ever fled further from Macbeth than across the flat scene, according to the stage direction. Neither were Banquo or his son ancestors of the house of Stuart. All these things are now known; but the mind retains pertinaciously the impression made by the impositions of genius.^m

WILLIAM ROBERTSON ON THE REAL MACBETH

Very few kings of so remote a period have attained to the undying celebrity of Macbeth. As long as the English language endures, his name will be as widely known as that of the great Alfred, his character will retain the familiar features impressed on it by the magic genius of Shakespeare, and it will be as impossible to disentangle the historical personage from the weird being of romance, as to picture "the meek and hoary Duncan," a young and inexperienced prince, meeting his untimely fate in the flower of youth.

The quaint verses of the prior of Lochleven have embodied some of the tales and traditions handed down by the partisans of the rival families; and it will create little surprise to find that in a state of society in which "the rights of blood" were paramount, the stigma of illegitimacy was freely cast upon both competitors for the crown. Wyntounⁿ has recorded how Duncan, wearied with the chase, and separated from his usual attendants, found rest and shelter within the humble mill of Forteviot; how love bade the king return where chance had shown the way; and how Malcolm, whose blood has flowed in the veins of every English and Scottish king but Stephen, from the days of Henry Beauclerc, sprung from this intrigue with the "milnare's dowchtyr of Fortewyot."

As the taint upon the blood of Malcolm was supposed to be inherited from his mother, so the stain upon the pedigree of Macbeth was attributed to the mormaer's father; and in the same old verses it may be read how the mother of the Moray chieftain, wandering by chance in the woods, met with "ane fayr man, nevyr nane sa fayre as scho thowcht than," and how Macbeth was born "the Dewil's sone," and the inheritor of all his father's evil propensities. As the talisman of success was eventually upon the side of Malcolm, so the tales of the tyranny and crimes of his antagonist increased and multiplied, until they assumed the well-known form in the pages of Boece,ⁿ which, copied into the chronicle of Holinshed,^{aa} attracted the notice of the master-mind that has stamped the fiction with immortality.¹

It may be gathered from the circumstances of his early life that Macbeth did not attain even to the position of mormaer without a struggle. The two sons of Ruadhri—Roderick or Rory—the first known member of the Moray family, succeeded according to the Gaelic custom, Finlay filling the office of tanist during the lifetime of his brother Malbride. He was slain by his nephews, who evidently intended to retain the right of succession within their immediate branch of the family; Gilcomgain, who must have been chosen tanist on his brother's accession to the mormaerdom, following Malcolm to the exclusion of Finlay's son, Macbeth, whose right to the tanistship was undoubted, and who must have thus found himself shut out from the seniority to which he was fully entitled to aspire as representative of the junior branch of Rory's family. The union of Gilcomgain with a daughter of the Macalpine family must have still further strengthened his position, and as

[¹ Hume Brown^{*} sees an easy explanation for the blackening of Macbeth's name in the fact that later historians desiring to trace an unbroken line of kings back to primeval times, felt that Macbeth had interrupted the continuity, and was, therefore, a monster of evil origin and nature.]

[1006-1064 A.D.]

Macbeth is subsequently entitled *dux* by the contemporary Marianus,^o it may be conjectured that if he filled the office of *toshach*—duke or constable of the kingdom—during the reign of Duncan, it may have been conferred upon him originally as the natural opponent of the rival line of Kenneth Macduff, with which the kinsman who had supplanted him was closely connected.

The last two years of Malcolm's reign, however, witnessed the deaths of Gilcomgain and of his wife's brother; and though the name of the mormaer's enemy is not mentioned, it is hardly possible to doubt that when he was surprised and burned with fifty of his followers, it was the deed of Macbeth avenging the murder of his father and reasserting his claim upon the mormaership. The subsequent death of Boedhe's son transferred his claim upon the throne to his sister Gruoch, whose marriage with Macbeth reversed the position in which the mormaer had hitherto stood, and placed him in the position of Gilcomgain. Henceforth his interest was closely bound up with the family to which he had hitherto been hostile, though, had Duncan been prosperous, his fidelity might have stood the test. It was the disastrous career of this unfortunate prince which first seems to have aroused the ambition of Macbeth; but even then his hostility was secret. It was not in open battle that Duncan lost his life, nor was the crown of Scotland the prize of the victor in a hard-fought field, the final scene in "the smith's bothy" being strongly suggestive of treachery.

The historical Macbeth appears to have been an able monarch, and religious after the fashion of the age, for his reign has been handed down in tradition as an era of fertility and prosperity—generally a sign of the ability of the ruler; and he is recorded with his queen amongst the earliest benefactors of the Culdee society of Lochleven. With their joint grant to the little priory is associated the only historical mention of the true descent of the lady Gruoch; and the venerable Culdee who briefly registered their donation little thought that, in entering the simple notice, he was perpetuating the sole record of the real nature of the claims of his benefactors upon the throne they were accused of usurping. His liberality to the poor of Rome is also mentioned by a contemporary historian Marianus,^o but in such a manner as to leave it a matter of doubt whether the king was ever present in person at the Eternal City. [Skene ' thinks he may have gone there to secure absolution for the murder of Duncan.]

For five years after the fall of Duncan his successful rival reigned in peace, when an attempt was made by the adherents of the late king to regain their lost ascendancy. The children of Duncan were still in their infancy, and their cause was sustained by their grandfather, Crinan, the aged abbot of Dunkeld; but his defeat and death, "with nine times twenty warriors," extinguished for a time the hopes of the House of Atholl, and only served to secure the throne more firmly in the power of Macbeth. Seven years elapsed and the fortunes of the house of Moray were still in the ascendant, when several of the Confessor's Norman favourites, who were driven from England on the return of Earl Godwin, fled for refuge beyond the Tweed, and the asylum granted to the fugitives at Macbeth's court may have afforded a pretext for the hostility of Siward, who, two years later, invaded the dominions of the Scottish king. The whole force of the Northumbrian provinces collected around the banner of the Danish earl, and attacked Macbeth on the day of "the Seven Sleepers"; fifteen hundred of the Anglo-Danes fell in the contest, with the son and nephew of the earl, but Siward gained the day, slew three thousand of the enemy—the detested Normans amongst

[1054-1058 A.D.]

the number—and carried off a booty unprecedented in the annals of border warfare.

The great success of the Anglo-Danish earl is generally supposed to have reinstated Malcolm on the throne, but no such inference can be drawn from the accounts of contemporary writers, by whom no allusion is made to the Scottish prince; the espousal of the suppliant's cause by the Confessor, and the directions given by the saintly king to Siward to re-establish the heir of Duncan in his ancestral kingdom, only appearing in the pages of the Anglo-Norman chroniclers for the purpose of indirectly furthering the subsequent feudal claims of the English kings. As the rout of the Scottish army before the walls of Durham and their subsequent contest with Thorfinn Sigurdson hastened the catastrophe of the first king of the house of Atholl, so the unsuccessful issue of his encounter with Earl Siward may have eventually proved fatal to the mormaer; but Macbeth held his ground for four years, and the grave had long closed over the Danish earl, when the defeat and death of his former antagonist at Lumphanan [August 15th, 1057] in Aberdeenshire, removed the first obstacle from the path of the youthful Malcolm. For three or four months the contest still continued to be maintained by Gilcomgain's son Lulach, the feeble successor of his able kinsman, until his death in Strathbogie [March 17th, 1058], where he is said to have been betrayed, or to have lost his life through some stratagem of his enemies, put an end for the time to the struggle between the rival houses, and the heir of Duncan without further difficulty obtained possession of the vacant throne.

Wyntoun ⁷ is the first to mention the popular story of Birnam Wood coming to Dunsinane, but he places the death of Macbeth at Lumphanan, attributing it to "a knyght nowcht borne of wyf," who is transformed by Boeceⁿ into Macduff. As Fife was "in the crown" in the days of Malcolm Canmore, who granted the earldom to his son Æthelred, the Macduff earl of Fife of the fabulists—a being unknown to Wyntoun—must be set down at a myth.^{hh}





CHAPTER II

FROM MALCOLM CANMORE TO DAVID I

[1058-1153 A.D.]

Directly and indirectly the Norman Conquest influenced Scotland only less profoundly than England itself. In the case of Scotland it was less immediate and obtrusive, yet in its totality it is a fact of the first importance in the national history. In its full measure that influence will appear only in the gradual modification of Scottish society and Scottish institutions throughout the reigns of Malcolm and his successors. On Malcolm's personal fortunes the Conquest had a direct and lasting effect.—HUME BROWN. 6

MALCOLM (III) CANMORE (1058-1093 A.D.) BEGINS A NEW ERA

WHEN Lulach, who had continued the war after the death of Macbeth, and who is nominally counted a king, though called the "fatuous," was slain at Essie in Strathbogie, several months later, Malcolm Canmore, or Ceanmore [*i.e.*, Greathead], became king. With his reign a new and clearer era of the history of Scotland commences.

The Scottish Gaels had proved themselves capable of government. The united monarchy of Scone lasted for two centuries in spite of its powerful neighbours, but it was dependent almost entirely on the attachment of the clans to their chiefs and of the whole race to the hereditary king. It was traditional, not constitutional, with some accepted customs, otherwise it could not have held together, but with little settled law and no local government. It wanted the elements of civil life, for it had no organised towns or assemblies of the people. There was little commerce or trade. Cattle and sheep were the chief commodities and the medium of exchange. There is no trace of an independent coinage. Christianity had not yet leavened the whole population, though the monasteries were centres of light within limited circles.

The Celtic character, alien to set and quick forms of business, was alive to the pleasures of the imagination, oratory, and song. Its cardinal defect was a light regard for truth. Its chief virtue was devotion to a leader, whether priest, chief, or king. The Christian Anglo-Saxons of the Lothians, the

[1058-1073 A.D.]

Norsemen, only recently and half converted, in the islands of the north and west, brought qualities and customs into the common stock of the future Scottish people which were wanting to the Celts. The Anglo-Saxon in his original home, as in Britain the inhabitant of the plain—the creeping Saxon, as he was called by an Irish bard—developed in the house and the town a better regulated freedom, the domestic and civic virtues. His imagination, even his poetry, had a touch of prose, but he possessed qualities of plain speech, common sense and truth, the essence of trust. The contact—for it was a contact, not a conquest—with this race was of the highest value to the Scottish nation of the future. The Normans introduced new elements, the spirit of chivalry and the too rigid bonds of the feudal law. The changes due to these new elements began in Scotland in the reign of Malcolm Canmore, and were completed in those of his descendants. The Scottish Celtic kingdom became gradually civilised under Saxon and Norman influences, while retaining its native vigour. The result was the establishment of the independence of Scotland within its present bounds during the prosperous reigns (1107-1285) of the Alexanders.^c

THE TREATY OF ABERNETHY

Malcolm had passed about fifteen years at the court of the Confessor before he became king (in 1058) and in his long exile he must have formed various English connections, as well as become habituated to the manners of the sister country. He may, therefore, be supposed to have, from the first, kept up a more intimate intercourse with England than had been customary with his predecessors.

The principal events that make up the history of the reign of Malcolm arose out of his connection with the unfortunate Eadgar Ætheling. Eadgar fled to Scotland, according to the most probable account, with his mother and his two sisters, in the beginning of 1068 [?] and, soon after, Malcolm espoused Eadgar's elder sister, Margaret.^d From some cause, which is not distinctly explained, Malcolm did not arrive with his forces in time to support the insurrection of the people of Northumbria, in conjunction with the Danes and the friends of Eadgar, in the following year; and it was not till after the complete suppression of that attempt, and the whole of the east coast, from the Humber to the Tyne, had been made a desert by the remorseless vengeance of the Norman, that the Scottish king, in 1070, entered England, through Cumberland, and spread nearly as great devastation in the western parts of York and Durham as William had done in the east. He commanded his soldiers to spare only the young men and women, and they were driven into Scotland to be made slaves. After this raid, says the chronicler, there was no village or cottage in Scotland without its English slave or handmaid.

It was not till 1072 that William the Conqueror found leisure to chastise Malcolm for this inroad. He then advanced into Scotland and wasted the country as far as the Tay, though the inhabitants, after the plan which they had been accustomed to pursue in such cases from the days of Galgacus, and which they continued to follow occasionally to a much later age, destroyed or removed everything of value as the invader advanced, so that, as the Saxon chronicler ^d expresses it, "he nothing found of that which to him the better was." In the end, however, Malcolm came to him at Abernethy, in 1072, when, according to the *Saxon Chronicle*, ^d a peace was arranged

[^c "Her virtues more than his wars make his reign an epoch of Scottish history."—MACKAY.^c]

[1072 A.D.]

between the two kings, on Malcolm agreeing to give hostages, and to do homage to William as his liege lord. William then returned home with his army.

This transaction makes a principal figure in the controversy which was formerly carried on with so much unnecessary heat, and which still continues to divide historical inquirers respecting the alleged dependence, in ancient times of the kingdom of Scotland upon the English crown. The position taken by the asserters of this dependence appears to be that, from a date long before the Norman conquest of England, the Anglo-Saxon kings of that country had, in some way or other, obtained possession of the sovereignty of the whole island, and the kings of Scotland, as well as the princes of Wales, had become their acknowledged vassals. We may say, without hesitation, that this notion is directly opposed to the whole course of the history of the two countries.^a

In the words of Bishop Stubbs,^c the complicated question of the Scottish homage, an obligation based, it is said, on the commendation of the Scots to Eadward the Elder, on the grant of Cumberland by Eadmund to Malcolm, and on the grant of Lothian by Eadgar or Canute to the king of Scots, was one of those diplomatic knots which are kept *unsolved* by mutual reservations until the time comes when they must be cut by the sword. But in view of the importance given to the subject in learned debate, we give a somewhat lengthy review of it.^d

E. WM. ROBERTSON'S ACCOUNT OF THE ENGLISH CLAIMS IN SCOTLAND

An inquiry into the relations existing between the English and Scottish kingdoms in the olden time has ceased to be a matter of any but historical importance, the time being past when the forgeries of Hardyng were rewarded with a pension from an English king, and the arguments of Atwood burned by the common hangman by order of a Scottish parliament. The feeling, however, which prompted both the forgeries and the pension exercised an all-powerful influence over the chroniclers of both nations, after the question of feudal dependence had once been raised, and as the accounts of the earlier transactions between the two countries are furnished exclusively by the advocates of one side of the question, of whom it may be most truly said, in the language applied by Gibbon to the writers of a different age, "their knowledge will appear gradually to increase as their means of information must have diminished," great caution is necessary in weighing the evidence which is supplied from sources so open to suspicion.

The habit of forging charters after the Norman Conquest is notorious, whilst claims were frequently put forward, and often by the most sacred characters, about which it is difficult to decide whether they display the grossest ignorance or the most unblushing effrontery. The same class which supplied the forgers of charters and the fabricators of false claims also compiled the chronicles, and when recklessness of assertion was considered justifiable in the requisition of a bishop, urging the claims of his diocese upon the ecclesiastical head of Christendom, what limits can be assigned to the latitude of an advocate, engaged in asserting the supposed rights of his liege lord over an alien and often hostile kingdom?

Early Forgeries and Interpolations

The claims grounded in the feudal error on the "chronicled" dependence of the Scots upon the Anglo-Saxon monarchy, before the conquest, may be

[1073 A.D.]

said to rest either upon passages interpolated in a true text; actual forgeries and fabrications: or else upon amplifications and exaggerations of the truth. The reign of Eadgar, as depicted in the Anglo-Norman Chronicles, is fertile in examples of the second description. After the coronation of that king at Bath, he is said by three MSS. of the *Saxon Chronicle* ^a to have sailed to Chester, where he was met by six kings, who all pledged themselves to be his *efenwyrhtan*, or allies, by sea and by land. Æthelward,^b in the chronicle which he compiled for the use of his cousin, the Emperor Otho's daughter, though he alludes to Eadgar's coronation in 973, takes no notice of the meeting at Chester; but in the twelfth century, and in the pages of Florence ^c of Worcester, the coronation, which alone appears to have stimulated the poetic energy of the Anglo-Saxon bards, is completely eclipsed in importance by the subsequent progress on the Dee.

Eight kings now meet the English monarch, rowing him submissively to the monastery of St. John, and upon his return to his palace Eadgar turns to his nobles, with the remark that none of his successors ought to vaunt himself king of the Angles until he had enjoyed a similar triumph! It is easier to understand the process by which the six kings grew into eight, with Kenneth of Scotland in the van, than to account for the silence of the contemporary Æthelward, and of every Saxon chronicler before the Conquest, about a triumph to which Eadgar himself is supposed to have attached so much importance.

Two charters are connected with the supposed occurrences of this period, both of which have been condemned as spurious. The first was evidently intended to pass for a donation made at Eadgar's coronation, for it is witnessed by the eight kings "at Bath in the Feast of Pentecost," but dated unluckily in 966, five years before Kenneth could sign himself "*Rex Scotorum*," or Eadgar was crowned at "the city of sick men"! The second is framed far more skilfully, but bears evident marks of the Norman era of its composition, and some circumstances connected with it are especially worthy of notice. A new charter, dated in 971, and attested amongst other witnesses by Sigegar, was confirmed by the pope in 965, in the time of Sigegar's predecessor Aylward! The interpolation is unmistakable. Another fabrication which has been inserted amongst the events of this reign is the cession of the Lothian to Kenneth of Scotland, to be held of the English crown as a hereditary feudal fief.

Passages of the third description—amplifications and exaggerations of the truth—are occasionally more difficult to deal with. The events of some of the most interesting periods of Anglo-Saxon history were principally preserved in ballads, traditions, or legends, and too much stress should not be laid upon the minute accuracy of accounts handed down through the medium of such authorities, whose expressions, when they exalt the prowess or power of their favourite heroes, are apt, however they may have suffered in elegance, to gain rather than lose force in the Latin form under which they appear in later chronicles. Results alone can test their truth, and where fairly judged they will generally be found very accurate where no special end was to be gained by an opposite course. There is no difficulty, however, in ascertaining the real course pursued by the Anglo-Saxon kings whenever a prince of alien race submitted to their authority, Welsh history affording abundant examples, though it will be unnecessary to ascend higher than the reign of Alfred.

What were the practical results of the subjugation of Wales to the Anglo-Saxon monarchy? Her princes paid tribute to the English king, giving

[1072 A.D.]

hostages for their fidelity, and occasionally attending the court of their overlord, and subscribing his charters as *Subreguli*; her prelates, consecrated by an English metropolitan, received the pastoral staff from the English king; and her people, numbered amongst the subjects of the Anglo-Saxon crown, were included in Eadgar's laws amongst the "Angles, Danes, or Britons, on every side of my dominion."

No tribute was ever levied since the days of Oswy and Egfrid upon the Scottish people, no authentic charter attests the presence of a Scottish king at the English court to subscribe his name amongst the attendant *Subreguli*, and no Culdee prelate acknowledged the supremacy of the metropolitan either of York or Canterbury; and unless practical results of this description can be shown to have ensued, no passage in a chronicle, however reiterated or exaggerated in the pages of subsequent writers, will prove the dependence of the Scottish kingdom upon an Anglo-Saxon overlord.

It is unnecessary to enter upon the *Bretwalda* controversy, for, granting the theory in its fullest extent, the tribes beyond the Forth would scarcely have paid a deference to the Romanesque authority, supposed to have been first vested in a petty Sussex *Heretoga*, which they had invariably refused to the imperial lieutenants. The power of Oswy was based upon a very different foundation: it was won by the sword and lost by the sword; a veritable conquest as far as it extended, entailing a foreign bishop and foreign tax-gatherers, both bishop and *Gerefas* flying after the battle of Nechtansmere, and never more exercising jurisdiction or exacting *Gafol* beyond the Forth.

The Alleged Submission of Constantine II

No claim is again put forward to any authority over the Scots until a passage, occurring in two MSS. of the *Saxon Chronicle*,^d represents Constantine II as tendering a voluntary submission to the elder Eadward at Bakewell in the Peak, in the last year of that sovereign's reign. It is as follows:

"He went thence into Peac-lond, to Badecan-well, and commanded a *burh* to be built thereunto and manned. And then chose him to father and lord the king of Scots, and the whole nation of the Scots, and Ragnald and Eadulf's son, and all those who dwell in Northumbria, as well English as Danes and Northmen, and others. And also the king of the Strath-Clyde Wealh and all the Strath-Clyde Wealh."

How far does this passage agree with the true history of the period as far as that can be ascertained? Alfred's rule never extended over the Danes. Three years before his supposed appearance at Bakewell, Reginald Hy Ivar was in his grave. The *Irish Annals*,^e at this period most accurate and trustworthy authorities in all connected with the Hy Ivar family, place his death in 921. Undoubtedly, the English chronology of this era is hopelessly confused, and Florence^f places these events under that year.

Malcolm I and Malcolm II

Eadmund's cession of Cumberland to Malcolm I as a *læn* was the cause, and the result, of the first authenticated meeting between an Anglo-Saxon and a Scottish king. It was made over on the frontier, and it was upon the frontier again that, after the assassination of Eadmund, the Scots renewed their oaths to his successor Eadred. The grant lapsed upon the death of Malcolm, and was never renewed; and as no more mention is ever made of "the Scottish oaths," they must have been given in relation to this grant

[1073 A.D.]

of Cumberland, the withdrawal of the *læn* from Malcolm's successor Indulf affording, perhaps, a reason for that king's invasion of the Lothians and capture of Edinburgh. It is scarcely necessary to point out the usual confusion between Scots and Danes in the account of Malmesbury¹ that the former "chose Eric for their king," and suffered accordingly with the Danes.

Eadgar's reign has already been noticed, and the Scots are not again mentioned, even by the Anglo-Norman chroniclers, before the reign of Canute, who is said by three MSS. of the *Saxon Chronicle*^a to have marched to the north on his return from Rome in 1031, when Malcolm II "became his man, but only held that allegiance a little while." Lothian had by this time been annexed to the Scottish dominions, either by actual conquest or by the cession of Eadulf Cudel—a cession which stands out in strong contrast to the idea of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy which the later chroniclers and their followers would wish to convey. Who ever heard of two feudatories annexing, or resigning, territories without the permission of their overlord?

William the Conqueror and Malcolm Canmore

The earliest connection between a king of Scotland and one of the Norman line of English kings was brought about through the reception and encouragement afforded to Eadgar Ætheling and his supporters by his sister's husband, Malcolm Canmore. Uneasy at the favour shown to the Saxon exiles, William marched to the north, and at a meeting at Abernethy, beyond the Forth, Malcolm "became his man," giving up his son Duncan as a hostage for the fulfilment of the engagements then contracted. Some light is thrown upon the nature of these engagements by the subsequent transactions between Malcolm and Rufus, for nineteen years after the treaty of Abernethy, when Robert and Eadgar arranged a peace between the hostile kings, it was agreed, "ut Willielmo, sicut patri suo obedivit, Malcolmus obediret, et Malcolmus xii. villas, quas in Anglia sub patre illius habuerat, Willielmus rederet, et xii. marcas auri singulis annis daret."

Nearly two years, however, were suffered to elapse without any steps being taken by William to carry out this arrangement, until a severe illness induced him to yield to the suggestions of his nobles, who were anxious to re-establish a firm peace between the two countries; and accordingly, on the arrival of an embassy from Malcolm, a meeting was proposed at Gloucester. On the arrival of Malcolm, however, who had been conducted to the place of meeting with all due honour by Eadgar Ætheling, Rufus, now recovered from his illness, refused to hold any communication with him, referring him to the judgment of the English barons alone—a course to which Malcolm refused to submit, objecting "to do right" to the English king except by the judgment of the peers of both realms, and upon the frontiers of the two kingdoms.¹

¹ Certain inferences are sometimes drawn from the expression *rectitudinem facere*, "to do right"—though it is always dangerous to lay too much stress upon the strict and exact legal meaning of every word employed by a chronicler—and it is implied that "right" could only be "done" by "a vassal to his superior," and that, therefore, Malcolm was William's vassal—for the kingdom of Scotland. The simple answer to this is, that not an acre of land could be held under the feudal system by "noble tenure," except by homage, or vassalage, the extent of the vassalage being identical with the extent of the fief, and not necessarily implying the entire dependence of the holder upon the overlord of the fief. He might hold other fiefs of innumerable other overlords. Thus in a treaty of peace between Philip Augustus and Richard, the latter agrees "ut ipse faciet Regi Franciæ *servitiis et justiciis in curia Regis Franciæ* de singulis feodis quos ab eo tenet"; so that the English king was ready "to do service and 'right' in the French king's court" for every fief he held of him, without in the least implying the subjection of the English crown to the French.

[1072 A.D.]

Hence it may be gathered that Malcolm had received a grant of manors, and a yearly subsidy, in return for his homage at Abernethy; and as he was willing to renew his homage on the same conditions—to obey William as he had obeyed his father—whilst he resented the demand of Rufus by a declaration of war, it is evident that this demand must have been an innovation upon the original agreement. Had Malcolm become the liegeman of the conqueror at Abernethy for the kingdom of Scotland, he would have held it from that time forward as a fief of the English crown, and there could have been no reasonable objection against his “doing right” in the court of his overlord, and according to the judgment of “his peers,” the English barons, as his tenure would have been exactly similar to theirs. Nor must it be forgotten that it was Malcolm, and not William, who sought for the re-establishment of the conqueror’s arrangement, a most inexplicable line of conduct if it is to be assumed that the Scottish king was eager to lay the independence of his kingdom at the feet of the English monarch, but perfectly intelligible on the supposition that Malcolm was anxious for a renewal of his subsidy, which Rufus was unwilling to grant without a further acknowledgment of dependence.

The struggle of King Alexander was against the encroachments of the English church, and the tenacity with which he opposed everything that could “in any way derogate from the liberty or dignity of the Scottish kingdom,” marks the manner in which he would have met any encroachments upon the independence of his crown. His successor David was an English baron, and, as such, was the first to swear allegiance to his niece Matilda in the great council held at London in 1126; and had Alexander been the liegeman of Henry for his kingdom, most assuredly would he have been present at Salisbury ten years earlier, when, “*Conventio optimatum et baronum totius Angliæ apud Saresberiam facta est. Qui in præsentia regis Henrici homagium filio suo Willielmo fecerunt, et fidelitatem juraverunt.*” The absence of the elder brother, who held no lands in England, from the earlier council, and the presence of the younger, who held the Honour of Huntingdon, at the later, distinctly mark that the homage must have been performed for fiefs in England. When there were no fiefs held, no homage was required.

By the Convention of Falaise, “William, king of Scots, became the liegeman of his lord the king of England, against all men, for Scotland, and for all his other lands, and performed fealty to him as to his liege lord, as all the other lieges of the king were accustomed to do; and also to king Henry the son, saving his fealty to king Henry the father.” All the king of Scotland’s lieges, whether clergy or laity, became in consequence the liegemen of the English king; English garrisons, paid out of the Scottish revenue, were to be introduced into five of the principal Scottish castles; and all English fugitives for felony were to be captured by the king of Scots, and given over to English justice (unless they were ready of their own will “to stand to



BRITISH TOMB

right" in the English court); whilst Scottish fugitives might, if they chose, "stand to right" in the English court. In consequence of this arrangement, William, his earls, and his barons, were frequent attendants as vassals "in the court of their lord the king of England," to whose decision the Scottish king was obliged to submit in his contest about the see of St. Andrews, and whose license he was obliged to obtain before repressing the disturbances in Gallo-way. Such were some of the immediate consequences of "homage for the kingdom of Scotland."

By the charter given by Richard to William at Canterbury, Roxburgh, and Berwick, the remaining castles occupied by English garrisons were restored to William as his absolute and inalienable property, all the stipulations which Henry "per novas chartas et per captionem suam extorsit" were declared null and void, and the relations between the two kingdoms were to be re-established on the same footing as in the reign of Malcolm IV, all claims being settled according to the decision of four English nobles to be named by William, and four Scottish nobles to be chosen by Richard. All the lands held by Malcolm in the county of Huntingdon, and elsewhere, were to be held on the same tenure by William; the allegiance sworn to Henry by William's vassals was resigned and given back; and William then became the liegeman of Richard "for all the lands for which his predecessors had been liegemen of the English kings."

As by the restoration of the allegiance of the vassals of the Scottish crown to their native sovereign the relations between the two kingdoms were restored to "their original footing," and as it is clearly shown by this charter that liege homage for Scotland, and its consequences—the rights and prerogatives of an overlord which were exercised by Henry—had been extorted from William "per novas chartas et captionem suam," such "original footing" must have been that of independence. As in the reign of Malcolm the allegiance of the Scots was due to their native sovereign alone, that sovereign could have acknowledged no overlord of the lands for which they rendered it; and as Malcolm was "homo regis Angliæ eo modo quo avus suus fuerat homo veteris Henrici," it follows necessarily that the homage rendered by Malcolm and David to the kings of England could not have been homage for their native kingdom. Nor was such homage ever again performed by William, his son, or his grandson; or it would have inevitably been followed by the English king repeating the conduct of Henry II, and exercising the prerogatives of an overlord over Scotland proper, and all the vassals of the Scottish crown.

The True Meaning of "Homage"

In the feudal era, when any one became the vassal of another, he first performed the homage, and then received the fiefs for which the homage was rendered. The homage might be either general or specified, vague or for fiefs particularised, liege or simple. Thus, after some dispute, Edward III acknowledged himself "the liegeman of King Philip of France against all men," for the duchy of Guyenne and the country of Ponthieu: his homage was liege, and the fiefs for which it was rendered were specified. The homage extorted from William by Henry "per novas chartas et per captionem suam," was distinctly specified as "liege homage for the kingdom of Scotland and all his other lands." That rendered at York by Alexander II, in 1287, was for the lands he received in England in compensation for his claims—*de prædictis terris*. In other cases, and often where the nature or extent of the

[1072 A.D.]

homage was a matter of dispute, it was tendered in general terms, and a reservation was often made by the tenderer, or the acceptor, or by both.

Thus, in the case of Philip and Edward, alluded to above, the former accepted the liege homage of Edward *sauz son droit*—the very words so often occurring in the transactions relating to homage between the English and Scottish kings—with a reservation of his claims as actual proprietor of certain lands in Gascony. So, also, in the English version of the homage rendered by Alexander III to Edward I, after he had become “the liegeman of the king of England against all men,” Edward is represented as accepting his homage “*salvo jure et clamio . . . pro homagio pro regno Scotiæ.*” Evidently, according to the feudal interpretation, and as the writer of the Memorandum understood it, a tender of homage in general terms did not necessarily carry with it anything more than the vague and general allegiance of the homager; and Edward is accordingly represented as accepting such general homage with a reservation of his further claims. In all cases of vague and general homage it is important to bear this in mind.

The homage performed by the kings of Scotland appears to have been usually of this vague description, and tendered in general terms—not unlike the first homage of Edward III to Philip “*par paroles generales, en disant que nous en trioms en son homage par ainsi come nous et noz predecessours, ducs de Gyenne, estoient jadis entrez en l’omage des rois de France*”—and often, in the first instance, with a reservation.

It was only at the commencement of a new reign, or upon the acceptance of a new fief, that the question of homage was of any real importance. Once tendered and accepted in the terms usually agreed upon, its repetition on the coronation of an heir, or on any other similar occasion, added no real strength to the original tie, and was simply the reiteration of a form already settled. It was of no more intrinsic importance than the repetition of the ceremony of kissing hands on each successive appointment, a ceremony, indeed, which represents in the present day the old feudal tender of homage in acknowledgment of a royal grant.

In short, the real question of the feudal superiority of the one country over the other resolves itself into the inquiry, What did Henry gain by the Convention of Falaise? According to the wording of the treaty, he gained a distinct acknowledgment of the feudal dependence of Scotland upon his crown; and if the history of the period is to be believed, he unsparingly exercised, during the remainder of his reign, the prerogatives of an overlord which he had thus acquired. Such, however, would have been the normal condition of Scotland had her kings always performed homage for their native kingdom; the Convention of Falaise would have been a mockery, and Henry would have reaped no advantage from the fortunate accident which placed William at his mercy.

Everything connected with this question has so long been the subject of bitter contention, and has been so frequently argued with all the bias of strong partisanship, that it is not a little difficult to avoid occasionally following in the usual beaten track. But on viewing the relations between the two countries after the Norman conquest as much as possible in the spirit of a judge rather than in that of an advocate of either party, it will be found that the claims of the more powerful kingdom on the feudal dependence of the weaker were scarcely, in the first instance, the result of any settled plan or deep-laid scheme of policy—much less of a traditional dependence of centuries upon a mythical Saxon empire—but grew up by degrees out of the events of a later period.

[1072 A.D.]

When William the Norman marched northwards, six years after his victory at Hastings had placed him upon the throne of England, his hold upon his new kingdom was scarcely yet firmly established. Northumbria was still in that disturbed and lawless condition which, ten years later, prevented its northern portion from being included in the general survey of the kingdom; and it was his object, not to add another to the many elements of discord in the north by asserting an empty claim to the dependence of Scotland, but to secure the peace of his northern frontiers. When the Norman army, in overwhelming force, was once transported beyond the "Scotswater," Malcolm, who had no power of retiring upon the northern districts, where the population was either lukewarm in his cause or openly hostile to it, at once came to terms; and the Treaty of Abernethy secured peace in this quarter, with one trifling exception, during the remainder of William's reign. The Ætheling was now encouraged to come to terms with his kinsman's new ally; his supporters no longer received the assistance which had hitherto been openly accorded them; and William henceforth was at leisure to turn his whole attention fearlessly elsewhere.

All this was brought about by the same means through which the English ministry were accustomed, about two centuries ago, to pacify the Highlands—he pensioned Malcolm. The grant of manors, and the annual subsidy of twelve marks of gold, were nothing else than a pension, necessarily acknowledged in the feudal era by homage—for all "gentle tenure" was at this period held by free or gentle service, necessitating homage—or else the pension would have been a tribute. The subsequent conduct of Rufus seems to have been dictated by overweening arrogance rather than policy—*nimia superbia*—for he appears to have cared little about deriving any fixed and permanent advantage from circumstances which must have unquestionably enabled him to attach any terms he chose to the assistance he rendered to the two older sons of Malcolm Canmore. He was satisfied, apparently, with a vague admission of his general superiority—and amidst all his faults there were gleams, occasionally, of a careless generosity in the character of the Red King—but it must not be forgotten that peace, rather than conquest, was the policy of the Norman kings upon their northern frontier.

Henry raised no claims upon the kingdom of his queen's brothers, and he appears to have discouraged rather than promoted the pretensions of the see of York. Alexander, accordingly, was not amongst the great liegemen of the English crown who tendered their allegiance to the ill-fated heir of Henry and "good Queen Maud"; but David was situated differently, being an English baron in right of the Honour of Huntingdon, and a connection of a more intimate description was thus established between the two crowns.

From this period it became the settled object of the Scottish kings to assert their ancestral claim upon the northern counties, which, if admitted, would have undoubtedly gone far towards reuniting the greater portion of the old Bernician kingdom under the male representative of the Saxon line; whilst the English kings were always naturally averse to add the important earldom of Northumberland to the other fiefs, conferred upon the royal family of Scotland in virtue of their descent from Earl Waltheof. The results of Stephen's troubled reign, however, and the political necessities of Henry Fitz-Empress in his early years, all but annexed that earldom to the Scottish crown, and the demands of Henry with which Malcolm complied at Chester—demands which will be best justified on the plea of expediency—simply replaced the kingdoms on their earlier footing.*

[1072-1093 A.D.]

LAST YEARS OF MALCOLM AND HIS QUEEN MARGARET (1072-1093 A.D.)

To return to the reign of Malcolm Canmore—after the submission at Abernethy he appears to have remained quiet for some years. He did not, however, finally abandon the cause of his brother-in-law, the Ætheling; and in 1079, choosing his opportunity when the English king was engaged in war with his son Robert on the Continent, he again took up arms and made another destructive inroad into Northumberland. The following year, after the reconciliation of William and his son, the latter was sent at the head of an army against Scotland; but he soon returned without effecting anything. It was immediately after this expedition that the fortress bearing the name of the Castellum Novum, on the Tyne, which gave origin to the town of Newcastle, was erected as a protection against the invasions of the Scots.

When Rufus succeeded to the English throne, the two countries appear to have been at peace. But in the summer of 1091 we find Malcolm again invading Northumberland. Rufus immediately made preparations to attack Scotland both by sea and land; and, although his ships were destroyed in a storm, he advanced to the north with his army before the close of the year. We have already related in the history the course and issue of this new war. After being suspended for a short time by a treaty made, according to the *Saxon Chronicle*,⁴ "at Lothian in England," whither Malcolm came "out of Scotland," and awaited the approach of the enemy, it was renewed by the refusal of the Scottish king to do the English king right—that is, to afford him satisfaction about the matter in dispute between them, anywhere except at the usual place—namely, on the frontiers, and in presence of the chief men of both kingdoms. Rufus required that Malcolm should make his appearance before the English barons alone, assembled at Gloucester, and submit the case to their judgment.

"It is obvious on feudal principles," as Allen⁵ observes, "that if Malcolm had done homage for Scotland to the king of England, the Scotch nobles must have been *rere-vassals* of the latter, and could not have sat in court with the tenants in chief of the English crown." Yet it is evident that the nobility of both kingdoms had been wont on former occasions to meet and form one court for adjudication on such demands as that now made by the English king.

The hostilities that followed, however, were fatal to Malcolm. He was slain [treacherously with his eldest son] in a sudden attack made upon him while besieging the castle of Alnwick, on the 13th of November, 1093.

The reign of Malcolm was one of the most memorable and important in the early history of Scotland. It was in his time, and in consequence, in great part, of his personal fortunes, that the first foundations of that intimate connection were laid which afterwards enabled the country to draw so largely upon the superior civilisation of England, and in that way eventually revolutionise the whole of its social condition.⁶ From the time of Malcolm Canmore, Scotland ceased to be a Celtic kingdom. He himself spoke the language of his forefathers as well as Saxon; but it may be doubted if any of his children understood Gaelic, any more than their English mother. All his six sons, as well as his two daughters, received English names, apparently after their mother's relations.

[⁴ It was ruled that the kingdom of Scotland, whatever might be its relations towards the kingdom of England, whether separate or united, whether dependent or independent, whether friendly or hostile, should be itself truly an English kingdom, a kingdom which was for some generations more truly English than the southern England itself.—FREEMAN.]

His marriage with the sister of Eadgar Ætheling exercised a powerful influence both over the personal conduct of Malcolm and over public affairs. There is still extant a Latin life of Queen Margaret, by her confessor Turgot,^m which is on various accounts one of the most interesting records of those times. Margaret was very learned and eloquent, as well as pious, and she exercised her gifts not only in the instruction of her husband, but also in controversy with the Scottish clergy, whose various errors of doctrine and discipline she took great pains to reform. Her affections, however, were not all set upon the beauty of spiritual things. She encouraged merchants, we are told by Turgot, to come from various parts of the world, with many precious commodities which had never before been seen in that country, among which are especially mentioned vestments ornamented with various colours, which, when the people bought, adds the chronicler, and were induced by the persuasions of the queen to put on, they might almost be believed to have become new beings, so fine did they appear.

Malcolm is traditionally said to have, with the advice of his nobility, made various important innovations in the constitution of the kingdom, or the administration of public affairs.¹ There is neither proof nor probability, however, for the statement which has been often repeated, that he introduced feudalism in a systematic form into Scotland. That state of things appears rather to have grown up gradually under the influence of various causes, and its complete establishment must be referred to a period considerably later than the reign of this king. The modern titles of earl and baron, however, are traced nearly to his time, and seem then, or very soon after, to have begun to supplant the older Celtic mormaor and Saxon thane. Surnames also began to be used in this or the next reign. But on the whole, it was probably not so much by any new laws which were enacted by Malcolm Canmore (the collection in Latin which has been attributed to him is admitted to be spurious), or by any new institutions which he established that Scotland was in a manner transformed into a new country in his days, as by his English education and marriage, the English manners which were thus introduced at his court, and the numbers of English of all ranks whom the political events of the time drove to take refuge in the northern kingdom. Much of the change, therefore, was really the effect of the Norman conquest of England, which in nearly the same degree that it made Saxon England Norman, made Celtic Scotland Saxon.

DONALD BAIN TO ALEXANDER I (1068-1124 A.D.)

The disastrous close of the reign of Malcolm, whose own death was followed in a few days by that of his excellent queen—worn out, it is said, by her vigils and fastings, and other pious exercises—afforded an opportunity to his brother Donald Bain [Bane or Ban, i.e. "the Fair"] to seize the throne. Malcolm's eldest son, Edward, had fallen with his father at Alnwick; his second, Æthelred, was a churchman; but he left four other legitimate sons, although they were all as yet under age. Donald is said to have remained till now in the western islands, where he had taken refuge, on the death of his father Duncan, more than fifty years before. He now invaded Scotland with a fleet fitted out in the western islands, and, with the aid of the faction which had all along been opposed to the English innovations of Malcolm,

[¹ On his death he left the kingdom in possession for the first time of the same southern frontier which it ever after retained. It was now separated from England by the Solway Firth, the range of the Cheviot Hills, and the river Tweed.—SKENE.*]

[1094-1107 A.D.]

carried everything before him. The children of the late king were hastily conveyed to England by their uncle Eadgar Ætheling; and Donald, as soon as he mounted the throne, expelled all the foreigners that had taken refuge at his brother's court.

He had reigned only a few months, however, when another claimant of the crown appeared in the person of Duncan, son of Malcolm Canmore [by his first wife Ingibiorg]. He had been sent, it seems, by his father as a hostage to England; and by now offering to swear fealty to Rufus, he obtained permission to raise a force for the invasion of Scotland. He succeeded in driving Donald from the throne and mounting it himself in May, 1094.

But after a reign of only about a year and a half Duncan was assassinated at the instigation of Donald Bain, and Donald again became king about the end of the year 1095. After his restoration he proceeded in his former course of policy, by favouring the Celtic and depressing the Saxon population. Affairs proceeded in this train for about two years; but at length, in 1097, Eadgar Ætheling raised an army, with the approbation of the English king, and marching with it into Scotland, after an obstinate contest, overcame Donald, in the beginning of the following year, and obtained the crown for his nephew Edgar, the son of Malcolm Canmore. "Edgar, like Duncan," observes Allen,¹ appears to have held his kingdom in fealty to William.

"These two cases, and the extorted submission of William the Lion, during his captivity (to be presently mentioned), are the only instances I have found since the conquest of any king of Scotland rendering fealty to England for his crown. Both occurrences took place after a disputed succession in Scotland, terminated by the arms and assistance of the English. Duncan was speedily punished for his sacrifice of the honour and dignity of the sceptre he unworthily held. Edgar appears to have repented of his weakness, and to have retracted before his death the disgraceful submission he had made in order to obtain his crown. One of his coins is said to bear the impress of 'Eadgarus Scottorum Basileus,' a title which, like *imperator*, implied that the holder acknowledged no superior upon earth."¹

On his second deposition Donald Bain was deprived of the power of giving further disturbance by being detained in prison and having his eyes put out. Edgar retained the throne till his death, on the 8th of January, 1107; and during his reign the country appears to have enjoyed both internal tranquillity and freedom from foreign war. The accession of Henry I to the throne of England, which took place in 1100, and his marriage the same year with Edgar's sister [Eadgyth, known in England as Matilda or Maud], had the effect of maintaining peace between the two countries for a long course of years from this date. This favourable tendency of circumstances was not opposed by the disposition of Edgar, whom a contemporary chronicler,

¹ "The Scoto-Saxon period, which began (A.D. 1097) one and thirty years after the Saxon period of the English annals had closed, will be found to contain historical topics of great importance. The Gaelic Scots predominated in the former period; the Saxon-English will be seen to give the law in this. We shall perceive a memorable revolution take place, concerning which the North-British annals have hitherto been altogether silent: we shall soon perceive a new people come in upon the old, a new dynasty ascend the throne, a new jurisprudence gradually prevail; new ecclesiastical establishments settled, and new manners overspread the land. In this period we shall see an Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Anglo-Belgic colonisation begin in the country beyond the Forth, and a Scoto-Saxon dynasty commence. In our course we shall perceive the prevalence of the Celtic customs insensibly superseded by the introduction of new manners, and the influence of a Celtic government gradually reduced, by the establishment of an Anglo-Norman jurisprudence, and by the complete reform of a Celtic church."—CHALMERS.^o The "reform" of the Celtic church was unquestionably for the worse.

[1107-1127 A.D.]

Ailred,^p describes as "a sweet-tempered, amiable man, in all things resembling Edward the Confessor; mild in his administration, equitable, and beneficent."

Edgar dying without issue, was succeeded by his next brother, Alexander I, "the Fierce." Alexander strengthened his connection with the English king by a marriage with one of Henry's numerous illegitimate daughters, the lady Sibilla, or, as she is called by other authorities, Elizabeth. A dismemberment, however, of the Scottish kingdom, as it had existed for some reigns preceding, now took place, by the separation of Cumberland, which Edgar on his deathbed had bequeathed to his younger brother David. Alexander at first disputed the validity of this bequest; but the English barons taking the part of David, he found himself obliged to submit. By this arrangement the king of Scotland would for the present (putting aside the doubtful case of Lothian) cease to be an English baron; and accordingly it appears that Alexander never attended at the English court. Nearly the whole history of his reign that has been preserved is made up of a long contest in which he was engaged with the English archbishops on the subject of their assumed authority over the Scottish church.

Alexander did not long survive the settlement of this affair. He had about two years before lost his queen, who had brought him no offspring; and his own death took place on the 27th of April, 1124. The quality for which this king is most celebrated by the old historians is his personal valour, of which various remarkable instances are related, although some contests with revolted portions of his own subjects, of which there are obscure notices, seem to have been the only opportunities he had of displaying military talent. But he sufficiently proved his intrepidity and firmness of character, in the manner in which he defended and maintained the independence of his kingdom, in the only point in which it was attacked in his time. In the stand which he made here he appears to have had with him the great body of the national clergy, and they and he were always on the best terms. David, earl of Cumberland, the youngest of the sons of Malcolm Canmore, now became king.^q

DAVID I (1124-1153 A.D.)

"Two circumstances, it may be, determined the emergence of a united Scotland," says P. Hume Brown.^b "Alexander died without an heir, and his brother David proved to be a king whose ability and good fortune were equal to the task of consolidating the entire extent of the country committed to his charge. In effecting this great work he introduced new factors into his policy which mark his reign as one of the notable periods of Scottish history. With the reign of David I begins the second period of the consolidation of Scotland. It is distinguished from the first by the fact that it is by Norman rather than Saxon influence that the process is now carried on." Having lived from his childhood in England, David's manners, says Malmesbury,^j were polished from the rust of Scottish barbarity. He had also, before he came to the throne, married an English wife, Matilda, or Maud, the daughter (and eventually heiress) of Waltheof, earl of Northumberland, and the widow of the earl of Northampton. The king of Scotland was now again an English baron, by his tenure of the earldom of Cumberland; and accordingly when Henry I, in 1127, called together the prelates and nobles of the realm, to swear that they would after his decease support the right of his daughter Matilda to the inheritance of the English crown, David was one of those that attended, and was the first who took the oath.

In observance of this engagement the Scottish king, on the usurpation of

[1126-1141 A.D.]

Stephen, led an army into England, and compelled the northern barons to swear fealty to Matilda. "What the king of Scots," said Stephen, when this news was brought to him, "has gained by stealth, I will manfully recover." He immediately collected a powerful force, and advanced at its head against David. They met at Newcastle; but no engagement took place; a compromise was effected (February, 1136), and David consented to withdraw his troops, on Stephen's engaging to confer on his eldest son Henry the earldom of Huntingdon, with the towns of Carlisle and Doncaster, and promising to take into consideration his claims, in right of his mother, to the earldom of Northumberland. Earl Henry did homage to Stephen for the new English honour he was thus to receive; but David himself still refused to do so, although he appears to have retained the earldom of Cumberland in his own hands.

The war was, however, renewed before the end of the same year by David, on the pretence that Stephen delayed to put his son in possession of the county of Northumberland, but, in reality, in consequence of a confederacy into which he had entered with the earl of Gloucester and the other partisans of the empress Matilda, who were now making preparations for a grand effort to drive her rival from the throne. With the same impetuosity he had shown on the former occasion, David was again first in the field. In 1137 David entered Northumberland, and ravaged that unfortunate district for some time, without mercy and without check.

In the beginning of the following year Stephen made requital by wasting the Scottish border. But the English king was soon recalled by other enemies to the south, and then David (in March, 1138) re-entered Northumberland, sending forward at the same time William, a son of the late King Duncan, into the west, where he and his wild followers of Galloway (on the 9th of June) gave a signal discomfiture to a party of English at Clitheroe. Meanwhile, Norham Castle, erected in the preceding reign by Bishop Flambard, on the south bank of the Tweed, to guard the main access from Scotland, surrendered to the Scottish king after a short siege; and from this point he marched forward, through Northumberland and Durham, to Northallerton, in Yorkshire, without opposition. Here, however, his barbarous host was met by an English force, collected chiefly by the efforts of the aged archbishop of York.

At the great Battle of the Standard, fought on the 22nd of August, the Scots sustained a complete defeat [as described already in the history of England]. The victors, however, were not in a condition to pursue their advantage. King David retired to Carlisle, and soon after laid siege to the castle of Werk, which having reduced, he razed it to the ground, and then, to adopt the expression of Lord Hailes,⁹ "returned into Scotland more like a conqueror, than like one whose army had been routed." The next year a treaty of peace was concluded between the two kings at Durham, by which David obtained the earldom of Northumberland, the ostensible object of the war, for his son, who enjoyed it till his death, and left it to his descendants.

David, however, was never cordially attached to the interests of Stephen. When, a few years after this, the cause of Matilda for a short time gained the ascendant, he repaired to the court of his niece, and endeavoured to persuade her to follow a course of moderation and policy, which her imperious temper spurned. He was shut up with her in Winchester Castle, when she was besieged there by Stephen, in August and September, 1141, and escaped thence along with her.

From this period the reign of David is scarcely marked by any events, if we except the disturbances occasioned by some piratical descents made upon the Scottish coasts by an adventurer of obscure birth, named Wilmund, who gave himself out for a son of the earl of Moray, but was at last, after giving considerable trouble, taken and deprived of his eyes, in 1151.

David did not live to witness the issue of the contest between Stephen and Henry. His death was probably hastened by that of his son Henry, which took place on the 12th of June, 1152, to the great grief of his countrymen, whom his amiable character had filled with hopes of a continuation of the same prosperity and happiness under his rule which they enjoyed under that of his father. Soon after this stroke David fixed his residence at Carlisle; and there he expired on the morning of the 24th of May, 1153, having been found dead in bed, with his hands joined together over his breast in the posture of devotional supplication. Both the virtues and the capacity of this king have been extolled in the highest terms by the monkish chroniclers; and he seems, on the whole, to have deserved the praises bestowed upon him. It is true that, among the acts for which he is most eulogised, his donations to the church, and his founding of numerous religious houses, stand conspicuous—in allusion to which his descendant, James I, is said to have feelingly complained of him as having been “a sore saint for the crown.”^o

Varying Estimates of David's Reign

Freeman¹ thus sums up the influence of David: “The influence of the reign of Edgar told wholly in favour of the process by which Scotland was becoming an English kingdom. The reign of Alexander told perhaps less directly in favour of things specially English, but it worked strongly towards the more general object of bringing Scotland into the common circle of Western Christendom. The succession of David reunited the Scottish dominions, and his vigorous rule of twenty-nine years brought to perfection all that his parents had begun. That famous prince was bound to England by every tie of descent, habit, and affinity.

“Under David, the great reformer, the great civiliser, but at the same time the king who made the earlier life of Scotland a thing of the past, all that was English, all that was Norman, was welcomed in the land which was now truly a northern England.”

In the words of Stubbs^c: “The Scottish constitution, as it appears under King David, was a copy of the English system as it existed under Henry I, but without the safeguards which the royal strength should have imposed on the great vassals. Hence the internal weakness which so long counteracted the determined efforts of the people for national independence.”

P. Hume Brown^b thinks that David's saintliness has been exaggerated, that he was purely selfish in his innovations, that many things credited to him by his over-ardent biographer Ailred, or Ethelred,^p were really due to the spirit of the times working in all Europe. And he regrets that a period so wonderfully fertile for a great literary effervescence should have given birth to no literature. “From neither the conqueror nor the conquered has a line come down to us.” None the less Brown admits that David definitely made the Roman church the national church of Scotland, that in his reign Scotland held the highest place in her history relatively in the scale of nations, and that “of all the reigns of Scottish kings, that of David is undoubtedly the most memorable in every aspect of the life of the people.”

Of David's influence on the population and the language J. Rhys^e says:

[1134-1153 A.D.]

"The court in the time of David was filled with his Anglian and Norman vassals. He is accordingly regarded as the first wholly feudal king of Scotland, and the growth of feudalism went on at the expense of the power and influence of the Celtic princes, who saw themselves snubbed and crowded out to make room for the king's barons, who had grants made to them of land here and there wherever it was worth having. The outcome was a deep-seated discontent, which every now and then burst into a flame of open revolt on the part of the rightful owners of the soil, which smouldered long afterwards as the well-known hatred of the clans of the Highlands for the farmers of the Lowlands, of the Gael, as Sir Walter Scott puts it, for the stranger and the Saxon, who was regarded as having reft the native of the land which was his birthright.

"As to the language, we read, that when Margaret, in 1074, called a council to inquire into the abuses which had crept into the church, Gaelic was the only language the clergy could speak, so that King Malcolm, her husband, acted as her interpreter. But the predominance of the Celtic element seems to have passed away with the reign of Donald Bain. At the time, however, of the War of Independence, Gaelic appears to have still reached down to Stirling and Perth, to the Ochill and Sidlaw hills, while north of the Tay it had as yet yielded to English or broad Scotch only a very narrow strip along the coast."

For a fuller picture of David's quiet revolution of Scotland, we may quote E. William Robertson's brilliant estimate.^a

The Great Achievements of David I

David was a good man as well as an able king. His faith was of the age, but his religion was from the heart, and there are few who will not respect the feeling that prompted his dying wish to be carried to pray before the black rood of his mother. Strict in the conception of his own religious duties, he was exact in requiring from the ecclesiastical body a decorous abstinence from all internal broils and dissensions, in return for the immunities and external peace he was zealous in insuring them, enforcing obedience, if necessary; though, it is said, that on one occasion he was obliged to kneel to an obdurate churchman before he could shame him into propriety.

A kindly and warm-hearted disposition is traceable in many of his acts, and is especially displayed in his consideration and thoughtfulness for his poorer subjects. In accordance with a regulation often found in other codes, and which was probably a well-known and general maxim of law, no one was allowed to bring a lesser cause into the royal court of justice, except as an appeal from a lower court; yet in spite of this enactment, which he seems to have been the first to introduce into Scotland, he appointed certain days on which, like an eastern king of old, he "sat in the gate" to give audience to the poor and the aged; and he would turn without a murmur from a hunting party to examine the appeal of a suppliant; if his decision was contrary to the expectations of his humble petitioners, kindly endeavouring to convince them of its justice—in too many instances a thankless and hopeless undertaking. The poor and the defenceless, indeed, were the especial objects of his protection. Conciliation may be described as the leading principle of David's policy.

Pursuing the policy inaugurated by his mother, Queen Margaret, he encouraged the resort of foreign merchants to the ports of Scotland, insuring to native traders the same advantages which they had enjoyed during the

[1124-1153 A.D.]

reign of his father; whilst he familiarised his Gaelic nobles, in their attendance upon the royal court, with habits of luxury and magnificence, remitting three years' rent and tribute—according to the account of his contemporary Malmesbury¹—to all his people who were willing to improve their dwellings, to dress with greater elegance, and to adopt increased refinement in their general manner of living.

Even in the occupations of his leisure moments he seems to have wished to exercise a softening influence over his countrymen, for, like many men of his character, he was fond of gardening, and he delighted in the indoctrinating his people in the peaceful arts of horticulture and in the mysteries of planting and of grafting. For similar reasons he sedulously promoted the improvement of agriculture, or rather, perhaps, directed increased attention to it.

In consequence of his measures feudal castles began, ere long, to replace the earlier buildings of wood and wattles rudely fortified by earthworks; and towns rapidly grew up around the royal castles and about the principal localities of commerce. The monasteries of Kelso, Jedburgh, Melrose, and Holyrood, with many another stately pile, also owed their first foundation to the fostering care of David; for, independently of his religious zeal, he



MELROSE ABBEY.

appreciated the encouragement afforded by such establishments to the pacific arts it was his aim to introduce amongst his subjects. The prosperity of the country during the last fifteen years of his reign contrasted strongly with the miseries of England under the disastrous rule of Stephen; Scotland became the granary from which her neighbour's wants were supplied; and to the court of Scotland's king resorted the knights and nobles of foreign origin, whom the commotions of the Continent had hitherto driven to take refuge in England.

Southern Scotland was the creation of David. He embellished it with the monasteries of his religious foundations; he strengthened it with the castles of his feudal baronage, and here he established the nucleus of feudal Scotland and the foundation of that importance which eventually transferred the preponderance in the kingdom to the south.

Another of the innovations upon ancient custom, traceable, apparently,

[1124-1153 A.D.]

to the reigns of Alexander and David, though more particularly to the reign of the latter king, was the introduction of the written charter as the necessary evidence of the right to freehold property. It was long before any of the northern nations attached importance to the written documents, which were at the basis of the whole system of free rights, or property, held by Roman law. It can scarcely be doubted that David was the originator of that important change by which a fixed title to land was acquired, producible, when necessary, in proof of ownership—a change which, in connection with the formal perambulation of boundaries, in the presence of “the good men and true,” must have done much to put a stop to those constant disputes about proprietorship, which had hitherto been settled by the sword.

David is often represented, in modern times, as the exterminator of his fellow-countrymen, granting their lands to foreigners, and driving out the native Scottish race, or enslaving them beneath the yoke of alien masters—a course that could have hardly earned the character ascribed to him by his friend and biographer, Ethelred, or Ailred,^p “he was beloved by his own people, the Scots, and feared by the men of Galloway.” It would be nearer the truth, perhaps, to describe him as the great confirmer of proprietary right throughout the settled portion of his kingdom.

If David may be looked upon as the regulator of the “two estates”—the clergy, and the baronage and freeholders connected with the land—he may be regarded as the founder of the “third estate” in Scotland, the actual creator of the free population connected with the towns. An intramural population was an anomaly amongst the people of the north, and in their older codes no provision was made for a free proprietary dwelling in towns, land, and land only, being connected with freedom and hereditary right. It was the Anglo-Norman burgh, with its feudal castle, and its civic population, distinct and separate from the garrison, which was the model of the burghs established, or confirmed, by David beyond the Tweed. It may be doubted whether any free communities engaged in commerce, and occupying walled towns, were in existence much before this reign, even in the Lothians, though the germs of such societies may have existed at Scone, Edinburgh, Stirling, and other places, which were of a certain importance at that early period.

Complete self-government, indeed, was conferred, from the outset, upon the Scottish burghers by a sovereign who was desirous of attracting such a class to his kingdom; and the enlightened policy of David, together with the state of peace and prosperity which he secured for the whole of the north of England, as well as for the settled portion of his own kingdom, soon filled the walled towns, which rapidly sprung up on every side, with a crowd of willing settlers from southern Britain and Flanders, who were guaranteed the enjoyment of even more than the usual freedom and privileges under the royal protection.

In imitation of their sovereign, the greater magnates, lay and ecclesiastical, occasionally enfranchised their towns, or founded burghs, filling them with a class of freemen on a footing with the royal burghers, though the latter were reckoned higher in the social scale, and were privileged to decline the challenge of a member of a lesser burgh.

The original burghers, as a class, were, with few exceptions, of foreign origin, emigrants from southern Britain, and not unfrequently Flemings; as in Berwick, where the Flemings long dwelt apart as a separate guild. It was long before the native element entered largely amongst the privileged civic population, clinging to Scottish customs and to the rural districts, espe-

[1124-1153 A.D.]

cially in the distant north, where the towns must have long stood out like commercial garrisons in a disaffected and not unfrequently a hostile country.

Not the least amongst the many changes introduced by the burgher class beyond the Forth was the diffusion of the language hitherto only spoken to the southward of that river. It would be difficult to overestimate the utility of the burgher class to the Scotland of that period, or its influence in promoting the amelioration and prosperity of the country.

Long before the death of Bede¹ flagrant abuses had crept into the English church, and the venerable historian laments the condition into which most of the monasteries had fallen throughout the dominions of Northumbria. Very similar causes to those which brought about such results in England were rife both in Ireland and in Scotland; and the Gaelic church had varied widely

from its original form and spirit when it presented to the astonished eyes of the dignified prelates of the Roman church in the twelfth century a picture, in which the abuses of encroachment and neglect had left but the shadow of a long-forgotten system of church government. The greater abbacies had become the hereditary appanages of powerful families where they were not still the objects of bloody contention; and the leading members of the septs, who filled the office of abbot, had sometimes ceased even to be in the holy orders. The Termon lands were leased out as the hereditary property of *herenachs*, members generally of the same families that possessed the abbacies; whilst vast



BLACKFRIARS' MONASTERY,
St. Andrews.

communities of monks, that eastern peculiarity which formed so prominent a feature of the Gaelic church in her best days, had dwindled into small bodies of Culdees,¹ the representatives of the clerical portion of the brotherhood—the twelve companions so invariably attending the abbots of the early period—who were frequently as remarkable for the amount of their private wealth as their predecessors, in the times of Columba and Aidan, had been renowned for their disinterested reluctance to acquire property of any description.

Each of the provinces that were originally independent must, at one time, have possessed its own monastery and bishop; but as the district kings had sunk under the dominion of the supreme sovereign, the bishops either disappeared altogether or became subordinate to, and dependent on, the bishop of St. Andrews; so that only three, or at most four, sees existed in Scotland when David ascended the throne. One of these must have been the bishopric of Glasgow, created, or revived, by the king during the lifetime of his predecessor Alexander; whilst the three remaining sees were St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Moray.

The first step towards remodelling the Scottish church was Alexander's regnant of the ancient donation of the Pictish Angus to the monastery of St. Andrews; but many years elapsed before David was enabled to complete the

¹ The word Culdee signifies nothing more than clergyman, and it was the general name for the clergy amongst the Gael. The Culdees can be traced in Ireland, just the same as in Scotland, and they were replaced by regular canons in the same manner. [The form "Keledei" is perhaps more strict.]

[1124-1153 A.D.]

measures which his brother had only commenced. Five other bishoprics were added to the four already existing, and the sees of Dunblane, Brechin, Aberdeen, Ross, and Caithness were created, or revived, in districts where hitherto the abbacy rather than the bishopric had been predominant; but it was long before all the Scottish dioceses attained the footing of regularly established bishoprics, like those of Glasgow and St. Andrews.

With the revival of these sees by David the rule of discipline sanctioned by the Roman church was introduced into the Scottish monasteries; and wherever the authority of the crown was paramount the numerous Culdee societies, which were scattered in every direction over the face of the country at the beginning of the twelfth century, were either suppressed altogether or deprived of their most important privileges.

David Compared with Alfred the Great


The influence of David upon his native country has been compared to that of Alfred upon England, and of Charlemagne upon a wider sphere, but in some respects it was of a different character. Alfred was the saviour of the Anglo-Saxon race from complete subjection to the Danes, and though he can scarcely be called a king of England, he was the real founder of the monarchy. Within the limits of his ancestral dominions, and of the rescued principality of English Mercia, he was the reviver of letters; the creator of a navy; the reformer of the army, upon which he expended a third of his revenue; and, as the builder of walled towns, he may in a certain sense be regarded as the originator of a burgherhood; but, like Charlemagne, he was a collector and not a maker of laws, the constitutional institutions which have been attributed to him belonging, unquestionably, to other periods. His was a policy of defence, not of aggrandisement—not even of amalgamation beyond the limits of the Anglo-Saxon race—of defence by sea and on land; of renovation rather than of innovation, for it was not an era for the development of great constitutional changes.

But David was a mighty innovator, scarcely reviving anything except bishoprics; and even in his ecclesiastical policy, in all other respects, he was equally an innovator. He instituted a feudal court, a feudal nobility, and feudal tenures governing the country upon feudal principles; for the great dignitaries of the court, in his time, were not merely the holders of honorary offices, but the actual ministers of the crown. He introduced the charter into general use, confirming proprietary right throughout the kingdom, the earls and freeholders by ancient Scottish tenure, henceforth standing, side by side, with the new noblesse and their vavassors, until all difference insensibly disappeared. He created a burgherhood, and laid down a novel code of law, by which the earlier system was gradually superseded by the principle still acknowledged—"the verdict of the neighbourhood."

"Augustus found Rome brick, and left her marble"; but David found Scotland built of wattles, and left her framed in granite, castles and monasteries studding the land in every direction. He found her a pastoral country, and before the close of his reign she is described as the granary of her neighbours; and though the expressions of Ailred or Ethelred^p are probably exaggerated, as an exporting country she must have made considerable progress in agriculture. England may trace the germs of her monarchy to Alfred, and of the union of her people under one sovereign, though it was certainly not consummated in Alfred's time. First amongst the Cæsars of the Western Empire stands Charlemagne, scarcely, however, the originator of the mighty

[1124-1153 A.D.]

results of that revival which still continue to influence the continent of Europe. But of feudal and historical Scotland, of the Scotland which counts Edinburgh amongst her fairest cities, and Glasgow, as well as Perth and Aberdeen, of the familiar Scotland of Bruce and of the Stuarts, David was unquestionably the creator. With the close of the eleventh century ancient Gaelic Alban gradually fades into the background, and before the middle of the twelfth, modern Scotland has already risen into existence."





CHAPTER III

THE LAST CELTIC KINGS

[1158-1286 A.D.]

"The real golden age of Scotland—the time of peace with England, of plenty in the land, of foreign trade flourishing, of internal peace, of law and justice—was the period of a full century following the treaty between William the Lion and Richard Cœur de Lion, comprehending the reign of William and the long reigns of the second and third Alexanders."—COSMO INNES.^b

MALCOLM IV, "THE MAIDEN" (1158-1165 A.D.)

MALCOLM IV, at the age of twelve years, succeeded to his excellent grandfather, David I, 1153. Being a Celtic prince, succeeding to a people of whom great proportion were Celts, he was inaugurated at Scone with the peculiar ceremonies belonging to the Scoto-Irish race. In compliance with their ancient customs, he was placed upon a fated stone, dedicated to this solemn purpose, and brought for that purpose from Ireland by Fergus, the son of Eric. An Irish-Scottish or Highland bard also stepped forward, and chanted to the people a Gaelic poem, containing the catalogue of the young king's ancestors, from the reign of the same Fergus, founder of the dynasty. The poem has not fortunately been preserved, and must not be considered in the light of one of Gibber's birthday odes. On the contrary, it was an exposition from the king to the people of the royal descent, in virtue of which he claimed their allegiance, and bears a sufficiently accurate conformity with other meagre fragments on the same subject, to enable modern antiquaries, by comparing lists, to form a regular catalogue of these barbarous kings or kinglets of the Dalriadic race.

The Celtic bard was usually a genealogist or *seannachie*, and the display of his talents was often exhibited in the recital of versified pedigrees. In a satirical poem, called the *Howlat*, such a character is introduced in ridicule. It was written in the reign of James II, when all reverence for the bardic profession was lost, at least in the Lowlands.

In Malcolm's reign the lords of the Hebrides, who were in a state of independence, scarcely acknowledging even a nominal allegiance either to the crown of Scotland or that of Norway, though claimed by both countries, began to

[1153-1165 A.D.]

give much annoyance to the western coasts of Scotland, to which their light-armed galleys or *birlins* and their habits of piracy gave great facilities. Somerled was at this time lord of the isles, and a frequent leader in such incursions. Peace was made with this turbulent chief in 1153; but in 1164, ten years after, Somerled was again in arms, and fell, attempting a descent at Renfrew.

Malcolm IV's transactions with Henry II of England were of greater moment. Henry had sworn (in 1149) that if he ever gained the English crown he would put the Scottish king in possession of Carlisle and of all the country lying between Tweed and Tyne; but, when securely seated on the throne, instead of fulfilling his obligation, he endeavoured to deprive Malcolm of such possessions in the northern counties as yet remained to him, forgetting his obligations to his great-uncle David, and his relationship to the young king his grandson. The youth and inexperience of Malcolm seem on this occasion to have been circumvented by the sagacity of Henry, who was besides, in point of power, greatly superior to the young Scottish prince. Indeed, it would appear that the English sovereign had acquired a personal influence over his kinsman of which his Scottish subjects had reason to be jealous. Malcolm yielded to Henry all his possessions in Cumberland and Northumberland; and when it is considered that his grandfather David had not been able to retain them with any secure hold, even when England was distracted with the civil wars of Stephen and Matilda, it must be owned that his descendant, opposed to Henry II in his plenitude of undisputed power, had little chance to make his claim good.

He also did homage for Lothian, to the great scandal of Scottish historians, who, conceiving his doing so affected the question of Scottish independence, are much disposed to find the Lothian, for which the homage was rendered, in Leeds or some other place, different from the real Lothian which they considered an original part of Scotland. But this arises from their entertaining the erroneous opinion that Lothian bore, in Malcolm IV's time, the same character of an integral part of Scotland which it has long exhibited. Homage was done by the Scottish kings for Lothian, simply because it had been a part or moiety of Northumberland, ceded by Eadulf Cudel, a Saxon earl of Northumberland, to Malcolm II, on condition of amity and support in war, for which, as feudal institutions gained ground, feudal homage was the natural substitute and emblem.

Besides the cession of his Northumbrian possessions, Malcolm seems to have attached himself to Henry II personally, and to have cultivated a sort of intimacy which, when it exists between a powerful and a weaker prince, seldom fails to be dangerous to the independence of the latter. The Scottish king was knighted by Henry in 1159, and attended and served in his campaigns in France, till he was recalled by the formal remonstrances of his subjects, who declared they would not permit English influence to predominate in their councils. Malcolm's return and presence, in 1160, quelled a dissatisfaction which had well-nigh broken out into open mutiny. He was also successful in putting down insurrections in the detached and half-independent provinces of Galloway and Moray. Malcolm IV died in 1165, at the early age of twenty-four years. Though brave in battle, he seems from his intercourse with Henry to have been flexible and yielding in council, to which, with some effeminacy of exterior and shyness of manners, must be attributed his historical epithet of Malcolm the Maiden. It could not be owing, as alleged by monkish writers, to his strict continence, since it is now certain that he had at least one natural son.

[1165-1174 A.D.]

WILLIAM THE LION (1165-1214 A.D.) BECOMES AN ENGLISH CAPTIVE

William, brother of Malcolm IV, succeeded him, and was crowned in 1166. He instantly solicited from Henry the restitution of Northumberland, and disgusted with the English monarch when it was refused him, opened a negotiation with France, this being the first authentic account of that intercourse between the countries which an idle legend imputes to a league between Achay or Achaius, king of Scots, and the celebrated Charlemagne, and by which the latter monarch is idly said to have taken into his pay a body of Scottish mercenaries.

William took advantage of the family discords of Henry II to lend that prince's son Richard assistance against his father. The Scottish king obtained from the insurgent prince a grant of the earldom of Northumberland as far as the Tyne. William in 1173 invaded Northumberland without any marked success. In the subsequent year he renewed the attempt, which terminated most disastrously. The Scottish king had stationed himself before Alnwick, a fortress fatal to his family, and was watching the motions of the garrison, while his numerous and disorderly army plundered the country. Meantime a band of those northern barons of England, whose ancestors had gained the Battle of the Standard, had arrived at Newcastle, and sallied out to scour the country. They made about four hundred horsemen, and had ridden out upon adventure, concealed by a heavy morning mist. A retreat was advised, as they became uncertain of their way; but Bernard de Baliol exclaimed, that should they all turn bridle, he alone would go on and preserve his honour. They advanced, accordingly, somewhat at random.

The mist suddenly cleared away, and they discovered the battlements of Alnwick, and found themselves close to a body of about sixty horse, with whom William the Scottish king was patrolling the country. At first he took the English for a part of his own army, and when undeceived said boldly, "Now shall we see who are good knights," and charged at the head of his handful of followers.

He was unhorsed and made prisoner with divers of his principal followers. The northern barons, afraid of a rescue from the numerous Scottish army, retreated with all speed to Newcastle, bearing with them their royal captive. William was presented to Henry at Northampton with his legs tied beneath the horse's belly; unworthy usage for a captive prince, the near relation of his victor.

THE TREATY OF FALAISE (1174 A.D.) MAKES SCOTLAND A DEPENDENT KINGDOM

We may reasonably suppose that, with his vindictive feelings towards his prisoner, Henry II was not likely to part with him unless upon the most severe terms, and the loss of the king was so complete a derangement of the system of government, as it then existed in Scotland, that the Scottish nobility and clergy consented that, in order to obtain his freedom, William should become the liegeman of Henry, and do homage for Scotland and all his other territories. Before this disgraceful treaty, which was concluded at Falaise in Normandy, in December, 1174, the kings of England had not the semblance of a right to exact homage for a single inch of Scottish ground,

[1174-1189 A.D.]

Lothian alone excepted, which was ceded to Malcolm II, as has been repeatedly mentioned, by grant of the Northumbrian earl Eadulf.

All the other component parts of what is now termed Scotland had come to the crown of that kingdom by right of conquest, without having been dependent on England in any point of view. The Pictish territories had been united to those of the Scots by the victories of Kenneth Macalpine; Moray had reverted to the Scottish crown by the success of Malcolm II in repelling the Danes; Galloway had also been reduced to the Scottish sway without the aid or intervention of England; and Strathclyde was subjected under like circumstances. A feudal dependence could only have been created by cession of land which had originally been English, or by restoring that which had been conquered from Scotland. But England could have no title to homage for provinces which, having never possessed, England could not cede, and having never conquered, could not restore.

Now, however, by the Treaty of Falaise, 1174, the king of England was declared lord paramount of the whole kingdom of Scotland; a miserable example of that impatience which too often characterised the Scottish councils.

An attempt was made at the same time to subject the Scottish church to that of England, by a clause in the same treaty, declaring that the former should be bound to the latter in such subjection as had been due and paid of old time, and that the English church should enjoy that supremacy which in justice she ought to possess. The Scottish churchmen explained this provision, which was formed with studied ambiguity, as leaving the whole question entire, since they alleged that no supremacy had been yielded in former times, and that none was justly due. But the civil article of submission was more carefully worded, and the principal castles in the realm, Roxburgh, Berwick, Jedburgh, Edinburgh, and Stirling, were put in Henry's hands as pledges for the execution of the Treaty of Falaise; while the king's brother David, earl of Huntingdon, and twenty-one Scottish nobles were surrendered as hostages to the same effect. Homage for broad Scotland was in fact rendered at York according to the tenour of the treaty, and the king's personal freedom was then obtained.

These were the principal transactions of William's reign after his release till the death of Henry II of England, omitting only some savage transactions in Galloway, which argued the total barbarity of the inhabitants.

RICHARD CŒUR DE LION RELEASES SCOTLAND (1189 A.D.)

The frontier castles of Roxburgh and Berwick still remained in possession of the English at the death of Henry II. On the succession of his son, Richard Cœur de Lion, a remarkable treaty was entered into betwixt the kings and nations, by which, after a personal interview with William, at Canterbury, Richard renounced all right of superiority or homage which had been extorted from William during his captivity, and re-established the borders of the two kingdoms as they had been at the time of William's misfortune, reserving to England such homage as Malcolm, the elder brother of William, had paid, or was bound to have rendered; and thus replacing Scotland fully in the situation of national independence resigned by the Treaty of Falaise. The stipulated compensation to be paid by Scotland for this ample restitution of her national freedom was ten thousand marks sterling, a sum equal to one hundred thousand pounds in the present day. The inducements leading Richard to renounce the advantages which his father had acquired in the moment of William's misfortune were manifest: (1) The generous nature

[1189-1214 A.D.]

of Richard probably remembered that the invasion of Northumberland and the battle of Alnwick took place in consequence of a treaty betwixt William and himself; and he might think himself obliged in honour to relieve his ally of some part, at least, of the ill consequences which had followed his ill-fated attempt to carry into effect their agreement. (2) Richard being on the point of embarking for the Holy Land, a large sum of money was of more importance to him than the barren claim of homage. (3) It was of the highest consequence that the English king, bound on a distant expedition with the flower of his army, should leave a near-bordering and warlike neighbour rather in the condition of a grateful ally than of a sullen and discontented vassal.¹

The money stipulated for the redemption of the national independence of Scotland was collected by an aid granted to the king by the nobles and the clergy; and there is reason to think that, in part at least, the burden descended on the inhabitants in the shape of a capitation tax. Two thousand marks remained due when Richard himself became a prisoner, and were paid by William in aid of the lion-hearted prince's ransom.

Domestic dissensions in his distant provinces, all of them brought to a happy conclusion by his skill and activity, are the most marked historical events in William's after-reign. Some misunderstanding with King John of England occasioned the levying of forces on both sides; but by a treaty entered into betwixt the princes the causes of complaint were removed, William agreeing to pay to John a sum of fifteen thousand marks for good-will, it is said, and for certain favourable conditions. William died at Stirling in 1214, aged seventy-two, after a long and active reign of forty-eight years [the longest in Scottish history].

William derived his cognomen of the Lion from his being the first who adopted that animal as the armorial bearing of Scotland. From this emblem the chief of the Scottish heralds is called Lion king at arms. Chivalry was fast gaining ground in Scotland at this time.

William the Lion was a legislator, and his laws are preserved. He was a strict, almost a severe administrator of justice. The blot of William's reign was his rashness at Alnwick, and the precipitation with which he bartered the independence of Scotland for his own liberty. But his dexterous negotiation with Richard I enabled him to recover that false step, and to leave his kingdom in the same condition in which he found it. By his wife, Ermengarde de Beaumont, William had a son, Alexander, who succeeded him. By illicit intrigues he left a numerous family.²

WILLIAM'S CONFLICT WITH THE POPE

An event requiring to be noticed in the reign of William is a remarkable contest in which he was engaged with the court of Rome. It began in 1178, when, on the death of Richard, bishop of St. Andrews, the chapter elected as his successor John Scot, an Englishman of distinguished learning. The nomination of a bishop by the chapter, without the royal consent, was a stretch of ecclesiastical authority which had never been quietly submitted to, either in England or Scotland, although any actual conflict between the claims of the spiritual and the temporal powers had usually been avoided by the king and the chapter uniting in the election of the same person.

[¹ The wisdom of this arrangement was proved by the fact that for more than one hundred years there did not occur one serious quarrel between the two countries.—P. HUME KNOWN.]

[1178-1215 A. D.]

But in the present case William had a particular motive for making a stand against the clerical encroachment, having destined the see for Hugh, his chaplain.

"By the arm of St. James," he passionately exclaimed, when he heard of the election made by the chapter, "while I live, John Scot shall never be bishop of St. Andrews!" He immediately seized the revenues of the see, and disregarding the appeal of John to Rome, made Hugh be consecrated, and put him in possession. When the pope, Alexander III, cancelled this appointment, and John was the following year consecrated in obedience to the papal mandate, William instantly banished him from the kingdom. The pope, on this, resorted to the strongest measures: he laid the diocese of St. Andrews under an interdict; he commanded the Scottish clergy within eight days to install John; soon after he ordered them to excommunicate Hugh; and, finally, he granted legatine powers over Scotland to the archbishop of York, and authorised that prelate, and the bishop of Durham, to excommunicate the king of Scotland, and to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict, if the king did not forthwith put John in peaceable possession of the see.

Still William was inflexible on the main point. He offered to make John chancellor, and to give him any other bishopric which should become vacant; but this was the only concession he would make. When the archbishop of York and the bishop of Durham called upon the clergy of the diocese of St. Andrews to yield obedience to John under pain of suspension, he banished all who complied with that summons. At last the two prelates went to the full extent of their tremendous powers, and actually pronounced sentence of excommunication against William, and laid the kingdom of Scotland under an interdict.

But at this point the death of Alexander (in August, 1181) prevented further consequences. William lost no time in making application to the new pope, Lucius III, who consented to reverse the sentence of excommunication, and to recall the interdict. The affair was ended by the pope himself nominating Hugh to the bishopric of St. Andrews, and John to that of Dunkeld, and so, to use the words of Lord Hailes,^e "making that his deed, which was the king's will." Lord Hailes observes that William, in the obstinate stand he made on this occasion against Pope Alexander, "seems to have been proud of opposing to the uttermost that pontiff before whom his conqueror, Henry, had bowed."^f

ALEXANDER II (1214-1249 A.D.) AT WAR WITH JOHN OF ENGLAND

It was at a momentous period of English history that Alexander ascended the throne, for it was the era in which the barons of England wrung from the fears of their dastard sovereign the great charter of their liberties. The barons of the north, who were conspicuous in the ranks of the disaffected, easily obtained the assistance of the young king of Scotland by a promise of the northern counties. Alexander had already escaped a danger from another quarter, which might otherwise have interfered with the meditated alliance. The accession of a youthful prince to the throne of Scotland had naturally been the signal for a renewal of the disturbances in the north and west, a brother of the last MacWilliam who, like his father, bore the name of Donald Bain, suddenly appearing in Moray with Kenneth MacHeth, the last of that ancient name who ever figures in history. Their career, however, was brief.


[1215-1216 A.D.]

Towards the middle of October Alexander crossed the borders; and while his army was occupied with an ineffectual investment of Norham, he received the homage of the barons of Northumberland at Felton, where Eustace de Vesci, by the presentation of a white wand, formally made over the three northern counties to his royal kinsman. John was now fast approaching Scotland, burning to vent his wrath upon Alexander for adhering to the cause of the revolted nobles. The Yorkshire barons laid waste their lands, and tendered their allegiance to Alexander on the very day on which John burned the town of Werk. Morpeth, Mitford, and Alnwick had already been destroyed; Berwick and Roxburgh were carried by storm, Haddington and Dunbar soon sharing the same fate.

His own ravages, however, and the policy of the Yorkshire barons, prevented John from penetrating further than Haddington, for he was soon obliged to retire from a district in which his troops would have perished before long for want of subsistence.

The month of February found the Scottish army engaged in retaliating upon Cumberland the ravages inflicted upon the fertile plains of the Lothians; a body of lawless irregulars, imitating the conduct of the foreign mercenaries at the abbey of Coldingham, by perpetrating a similar outrage at Holmcultram. After the arrival of Louis of France, Alexander, who had returned to Scotland, again crossed the frontier, possessed himself of Carlisle, a town always inclined towards the Scottish connection, and uniting his forces with the retainers of the northern barons, traversed the whole length of England to Dover, to tender his homage to the French prince as suzerain of his fiefs in England. During the march towards Dover the lands of the confederates were carefully protected from harm, the vengeance of the allies being reserved especially for the partisans of John, whose territories were harried without mercy whilst reconnoitring Bernard Castle. As the confederates passed Lincoln they carried the town by storm, putting the garrison of the castle to ransom; and on reaching London a close alliance was concluded between the French and Scottish princes and the barons, all pledging themselves, at a conference held in the capital, never to conclude a peace with their mutual foe which should not embrace all and each of the contracting parties.

In the confusion ensuing upon John's death, which occurred shortly afterwards, the followers of Alexander and the northern barons are said to have plundered the camp of the very army with which the deceased king had intended to intercept their return. After a protracted investment of the castle of Carlisle, the garrison surrendered on promise of their lives; and the fort at Tweedmouth, of which John seems to have ordered the reconstruction after the capture of Berwick, was destroyed by the Scots about the same time.



TOWER OF ST. ANDREWS

[1217-1249 A.D.]

In the following May Alexander, again entering England, commenced the investment of Mitford Castle; but upon learning the result of the disastrous battle of Lincoln, raising the siege, he retired into Scotland without engaging in further hostilities. He now received intelligence of the peace between Henry and Louis, a clause in their treaty extending its provisions to the Scottish king, on condition of returning all conquests made during the late war; and as his acquisitions were limited to the town and castle of Carlisle a reconciliation between the young kings was effected without difficulty, and a peace was speedily arranged.

Accordingly, in the beginning of December, 1217, Alexander was released at Berwick from the excommunication which he had incurred through supporting the cause of English liberty and the barons, and before the close of the same month he received investiture at Northampton of the Honour of Huntingdon and his other English fiefs and dignities, performing homage in the usual manner. His kingdom, however, still continued under the interdict, and though their king appears to have encountered little difficulty in appeasing the anger of the Church, the Scottish people were not finally absolved from the consequences of their sovereign's policy until they had largely contributed to the emolument of the legate Gualo.^o

In 1222 the king was engaged in subduing a rebellion in Argyll; and in the same year was obliged to visit Caithness, where the bishop had been burned in his house by the connivance of the earl of the same county. In 1228 it was the district of Moray which was discontented and disturbed by the achievements of one Gillescop, who was put down and executed by the efforts of the earl of Buchan, justiciary of Scotland. In 1231 Caithness witnessed a second tragedy similar to that of 1228, only the parts of the performers were altered. It was now the bishop or his retainers who murdered the earl of Caithness and burned his castle. This called for and received fresh chastisement.

In 1233 new tumults arose among the Celtic inhabitants of Scotland. Alan, lord of Galloway, died, leaving three daughters. The king was desirous of dividing the region amongst them as heirs portioners. The inhabitants withstood, in arms, the partition of their country, being resolved it should continue in the form of a single fief. The purpose of the king was to break the strength of this great principality, and create three chiefs who might be naturally expected to be more dependent on the crown than a single overgrown vassal had proved to be. Alexander led an army against the insurgents, defeated them, and effected the proposed division of the province. It is to be carefully noted, that all these wars with his insurgent Celtic subjects, though maintained by the king in defence of the administration of justice and authority, tended not the less to alienate the districts in which they took place from the royal power and authority; and the temporary submission of their chiefs was always made with reluctance, and seldom with sincerity.

Alexander II died in 1249, in the remote island of Kerrera, in the Hebrides, while engaged in an expedition for compelling the island chiefs to transfer to the Scottish king an homage which some of them had paid to Norway as lord paramount of the isles. Alexander II left no children by his first wife, the Princess Joan. His second was Marie de Coucy, a daughter of that proud house who on their banners affected a motto disclaiming the rank of king.¹ By her he had Alexander III, who, at his father's death, was a child of eight years old.^d

¹ Je suis ni roi, ni prince aussi—
Je suis le seigneur de Coucy.

[1249 A.D.]

Alexander died in the zenith of a prosperous career, and in the full vigour of manhood, for he had not yet completed his fifty-first year. He was a prince possessing many high and noble qualities. By dividing the vast possessions of the earls of Caithness, by confirming and supporting the native earls of Ross, and by enforcing the royal authority throughout Argyll, he effectually broke up the dangerous confederation in the north and west that had so frequently menaced the throne of his predecessors, and no outbreak in favour of MacWilliam, or MacHeth, signalised the accession of his youthful son. But though in pursuance of his favourite object—the consolidation of his kingdom—he was ready to enforce submission throughout the remotest Highlands, he was equally anxious to preserve peace upon his southern frontier; and though in his early years the influence of Eustace de Vesci drew him into the confederacy against John, after his alliance with Henry he never willingly disturbed the amicable relations of the two countries. Whenever any dispute arose between the kings, Henry was invariably the aggressor, though the bearing of Alexander, on all occasions, affords sufficient evidence that no unworthy fears prompted his desire for peace.

The reign of the second Alexander was in many respects an era of prosperity and advance, for his policy was peaceful, not aggressive, and directed principally to the internal amelioration of his kingdom.

ALEXANDER III (1249-1286 A.D.) IS OVERAWED BY HENRY OF ENGLAND

Scotland was rapidly advancing in church and state; but though a disaffected party no longer aimed at supporting a rival candidate for the throne, the spirit which had animated the conduct of the Scottish nobles was displayed under another form, and they now sought to influence that authority which they had formerly been inclined to resist. From this reign may be dated the rise of those two great parties whose contentions long disturbed the peace of the country, and hardly were the ashes of Alexander deposited in their last resting place at Melrose, before the animosity of the rival factions, kindling over the very grave of their sovereign, carried strife and dissension into the court of his youthful successor.⁹

Scotland began now to be threatened also by the intrigues of the English monarch Henry III, who, in the year 1233, had attempted by his agents at Rome to have the validity of Alexander II's coronation questioned, and to procure a papal acknowledgment of the dependence of that kingdom on the English crown. After some disputes and negotiations, the two kings had agreed in 1237 to an adjustment of their mutual pretensions, and it was settled that, in compensation for all Alexander's claims, he should receive lands to the amount of two hundred pounds a year in Northumberland and Cumberland, and thereupon he swore fealty to King Henry for the lands he held in England, according to the ancient practice.

Scotland was now a second time to be governed by an infant king. It was now that the king of England attempted more openly to enforce his claim to feudal superiority over Scotland, and no sooner was he informed of the death of Alexander II than he made his application to the pope that the coronation of Alexander III might be interdicted until Henry III of England should have given his consent. The opposition of the pope was anticipated and counteracted by hurrying the coronation; but objections were raised even at home. The day fixed for the ceremony, the 13th of July, 1249, was considered, according to the superstitious calendar of the age, an unlucky day; and according to the practice of chivalry one who, like the young

[1240-1268 A.D.]

king of Scotland, had not been knighted was incapable of ascending the throne before that ceremony had been performed. It was usual for a prince to be knighted only by a king, but the difficulty in this case was overcome by the boldness of Walter Comyn, earl of Menteith, who insisted that the archbishop of St. Andrews should first knight and then crown the heir to the throne; and the primate, calling to mind the example of Archbishop Anselm, who had knighted William Rufus, acted on the earl's suggestion. The coronation oath was explained to the young king in Latin and French; and to give the ceremony still greater solemnity, when he was placed on the fated stone, a Gaelic *seanachie*, or Highland bard, with a venerable beard and hoary locks, and covered with a scarlet robe, knelt before him and recited the royal genealogy in the language of his Celtic subjects.

Thus every precaution was taken to strengthen the claims of the young monarch to the allegiance of his subjects; yet his reign was one continued scene of intrigue abroad and faction at home, which eventually brought great calamities on his unfortunate country. In 1251, Alexander III married Margaret, the daughter of Henry III of England; and on that occasion, while resident at the English court, he did homage to Henry for his English lands; yet, when pressed to do homage for the kingdom of Scotland, he contrived to evade the demand by representing that he came there to be married, and not to treat of affairs of state, and that he could not take such an important step as that now proposed to him without the approbation of his great council. Nevertheless, Alexander allowed himself to be influenced by his father-in-law, who from this time took an officious interest in Scottish affairs, which gave great offence to the inhabitants of that kingdom, and raised up divisions and factions which continued long to distract it.

By these intrigues the Comyns and the great nobles who had hitherto ruled the kingdom were removed in 1255, and an English faction was raised and entrusted with the government. The discontented nobles, headed by the Comyns, confederated together, and taking up arms, seized the persons of the king and queen that they might rule in their names. The faction of the Comyns, which included most of the greatest families in Scotland, endeavoured to strengthen themselves by forming an alliance with the Welsh, who were then in arms against their English neighbours; and Henry, believing that his best policy was to yield, agreed, in 1258, to the formation of a regency in Scotland, which, by comprehending the chiefs of the several factions, satisfied them all and produced a temporary pacification. Alexander and his queen paid not unfrequent visits to the English court, at which the question of homage for Scotland was often pressed, but always steadily refused. The object of some of these visits was to obtain portions of Margaret's dowry, which Henry, pressed by his necessities, was slow in paying.

THE NORSE INVASION OF HAKON REPULSED (1262 A.D.)

In 1262 Scotland was threatened with a formidable invasion of Hakon (or Haco), king of Norway, which was averted for the moment by the interference of the king of England. The pretence was to support the interests of the Norse in the Scottish islands, which it had been the continued policy of the Scottish kings for some years to undermine. In 1263 Hakon appeared on the Scottish coast with one of the most formidable fleets that had ever left the shores of Norway, and proceeding to the mouth of the Clyde, attempted to effect a landing in the Bay of Largs on the 2nd of October, 1263. The weather was very tempestuous, which rendered it impossible for the

[1263-1264 A.D.]

Norwegian army to land in a body, and made the disembarkation exceedingly difficult and dangerous under any circumstances; while on the present occasion the Scottish army, encouraged by the providential state of the weather, opposed them with resolute bravery.

The Norwegians renewed the attempt to land day after day, till, discouraged by repeated defeats and the loss of great numbers of their warriors, they found themselves obliged to relinquish their design, and to put to sea again with their shattered navy. Hakon led his fleet through the strait between the Isle of Skye and the mainland, which has since been called after him Kyle Hakon, and after a disastrous voyage reached the Orkney islands, where, soon afterwards, sinking beneath the disappointment and mortification of his defeat, he died. His successor, Magnus, in 1266 relinquished his claims to the islands on the Scottish coast, except those of Orkney and Shetland, in consideration of the payment of four thousand marks and a quit-rent of a hundred marks a year.

Alexander was twenty-four years of age when he was thus compelled to place himself at the head of his army to withstand a foreign invasion. His attention was soon called off to other scenes of warfare; for when the barons of England rose in arms against King Henry, his son-in-law of Scotland sent to his aid a considerable body of Scottish troops, under the command of John Comyn, John Baliol, and Robert Bruce; but so distrustful were the Scots of the designs of the monarch they were going thus to assist, that they expressly stipulated that they joined his standard as auxiliaries, and not as feudal vassals, fearing that he might afterwards construe this act into an acknowledgment of his feudal superiority. The three nobles just named, who were at that time the most illustrious barons of Scotland, with many others, were made prisoners at the battle of Lewes, and they only regained their liberty after the battle of Evesham, in the subsequent year.

After their return Scotland enjoyed some years of peace, and Alexander, now arrived at full manhood, was occupied chiefly in resisting the encroachments of the clergy, in which his firmness and prudence were rewarded with success. On the accession of Edward I to the English throne in 1278, Robert Bruce, earl of Carrick, was commissioned by Alexander to perform the homage which was due to the English monarch for the rather extensive possessions held by the Scottish kings in England, and he was drawn by the crafty monarch into declaring his fealty in such general terms as were afterwards interpreted as an acknowledgment of the subjection of Scotland.

THE MAIDEN OF NORWAY

After the disastrous expedition of King Hakon, the hostilities between Norway and Scotland disappeared, to make way for a friendly alliance, which was cemented in 1281 by the marriage of Eric, king of Norway, with Alexander's daughter, the princess Margaret. The latter died in 1283 leaving only a daughter, called after herself Margaret, and known popularly in Scotland by the title of "the Maiden of Norway." Family misfortunes now began to crowd upon the Scottish monarch; he had lost his wife, Margaret of England, and in the beginning of 1284 he lost his only surviving son, named after himself Alexander, who a little more than a year before had married a daughter of Guy, earl of Flanders, but he had no child by her.

The only descendant that remained to Alexander was his granddaughter, Margaret of Norway. He called his great council, which assembled at Scone

[1285-1286 A.D.]

to settle the succession of the crown, and the nobles bound themselves to acknowledge the Maiden of Norway as their sovereign, if he left no male issue on his demise. But still wishing to leave a son as his successor, he married, in 1285, Joleta, the daughter of the Count de Dreux. Superstitious people observed omens attendant on the marriage festivities which they believed to bode fatal misfortune to the king and to the kingdom, and popular prophesies were supposed to be fulfilled when, on the 16th of March, 1286, as he was hurrying homewards in the dusk of the evening by a precipitous road along the sea-coast, between Burnt Island and Kinghorn, in the county

of Fife, his horse missed his footing and fell with his rider down the cliff, and both were killed. Scotland was filled with mourning at this unhappy event, and, in the midst of melancholy anticipations, the Maiden of Norway was called to the throne. Scotland was thus left to the rule not only of an infant (for Margaret was only three years of age) but a female.^a

By the time of Alexander III the process of dividing Scotland into sheriffdoms was nearly completed, the functions of the sheriffs corresponding to those previously exercised by the earls.

Alexander II had absorbed Argyll into the Scottish kingdom, and though he perished trying to subdue the Sudrey Islands, Scotland was so solidified by the peaceful reign of Alexander III as to assume the dignity of a nation occupying almost its present limits, as was also the case with England, though, as Hume Brown^c observes, no other "country in Christendom had in the



ABBROATH ABBEY,
Founded 1178.

same degree filled out its limits and welded its people." Spain had not yet conquered Granada or combined its five independent kingdoms, France was hardly half its present size, Germany was chaos, and Italy a tangle of jealous cities. Save for a few insurrections of limited extent, peace was almost uninterrupted. But Alexander III was the last of the Celtic kings of Scotland, and storms were to succeed the calm in the inveterate rhythm of history, and an old poet, seeing Scotland become the prey of English ambition, gave voice to a quaint lament, the oldest known fragment of Scottish literature:

Quhen Alysandyr, oure Kyng, wes dede
Owre gold was changyd into lede.^a

REVIEW OF THE PERIOD

At this remarkable point in history we pause to contrast the condition of Scotland as it stood in 843, when Kenneth Macalpine first formed the Picts and Scots into one people, and in the year 1286, when death deprived that people of their sovereign Alexander III.

At the earlier term we know that the manners of those descended of the

[343-1286 A.D.]

Dalriads, Scoto-Irish, or pure Scots, properly so called, must have been, as they remained till a much later period, the same with those of the cognate tribes in Ireland, the land of their descent. Their constitution was purely patriarchal, the simplest and most primitive form of government. The blood of the original founder of the family was held to flow in the veins of his successive representatives, and to perpetuate in each chief the right of supreme authority over the descendants of his own line, who formed his children and subjects, as he became by right of birth their sovereign ruler and lawgiver. A nation consisted of a union of several such tribes, having a single chief chosen over them for their general direction in war, and umpire of their disputes in peace. With the family and blood of this chief of chiefs most of the inferior chieftains claimed a connection more or less remote. This supreme chieftdom, or right of sovereignty, was hereditary, in so far as the person possessing it was chosen from the blood royal of the king deceased; but it was so far elective that any of his kinsmen might be chosen by the nation to succeed him; and, as the office of sovereign could not be exercised by a child, the choice generally fell upon a full-grown man, the brother or nephew of the deceased, instead of his son or grandson.

The Tanists and the Clans

This uncertainty of succession, which prevailed in respect to the crown itself while Celtic manners were predominant, proved a constant source of rebellion and bloodshed. The postponed heir, when he arose in years, was frequently desirous to attain his father's power; and many a murder was committed for the sake of rendering straight an oblique line of succession, which such preference of an adult had thrown out of the direct course. A singular expedient was resorted to, to prevent or diminish such evils. A sort of king of the Romans, or Cæsar, was chosen as the destined successor while the sovereign chief was yet alive. He was called the Tanist, and was inaugurated during the life of the reigning king, but with maimed rites, for he was permitted to place only one foot on the fated stone of election. The monarch had little authority in the different tribes of which the kingdom was composed unless during the time of war. In war, however, the king possessed arbitrary power; and war, foreign and domestic, was the ordinary condition of the people.

The clan, or patriarchal, system of government was particularly calculated for regulating a warlike and lawless country, as it provided for decision of disputes, and for the leading of the inhabitants to war, in the easiest and most simple manner possible. The clansmen submitted to the award of the chief in peace; they followed his banner to battle; they aided him with their advice in council, and the constitution of the tribe was complete. The nature of a frontier country exposed it in a peculiar degree to sudden danger, and therefore this compendious mode of government, established there by the Britons, was probably handed down to later times, from its being specially adapted to the exigencies of the situation. But though the usage of clanship probably prevailed there, we are not prepared to show that any of the clans inhabiting the border country carry back their antiquity into the Celtic or British period. Their names declare them of more modern date.

As other barbarians, the Celtic tribes were fickle and cruel at times, at other times capable of great kindness and generosity. Those who inhabited the mountains lived by their herds and flocks, and by the chase. The tribes

[843-1286 A.D.]

who had any portion of arable ground cultivated it, under the direction of the chief, for the benefit of the community. As every clan formed the epitome of a nation within itself, plundering from each other was a species of warfare to which no disgrace was attached; and when the mountaineers sought their booty in the low country, their prey was richer, perhaps, and less stoutly defended than when they attacked a kindred tribe of Highlanders. The Lowlands were therefore chiefly harassed by their incursions.

The Picts seem to have made some progress in agriculture, and to have known something of architecture and domestic arts, which are earliest improved in the more fertile countries. But neither the Scots nor the Picts, the men of Galloway nor the Britons of Strathclyde seem to have possessed the knowledge of writing or use of the alphabet. Three or four different nations, each subdivided into an endless variety of independent clans, tribes, and families, were ill calculated to form an independent state so powerful as to maintain its ground among other nations, or defend its liberties against an ambitious neighbour. But the fortunate acquisition of the fertile province of Lothian, including all the country between the Tweed and Forth, and the judicious measures of Malcolm Canmore and his successors, formed the means of giving consistency to that which was loose, and unity to that which was discordant, in the Scottish government.

Influence of Foreigners

We have noticed what willing reception Malcolm, influenced by his queen, gave to the immigrant Saxons and Normans, and the envy excited in the ancient genuine Scots by the favour extended to these strangers. All the successors of Malcolm (excepting the Hebridean savage Donald Bain) were addicted to the same policy, and purchased knowledge in the way in which it is most honourably obtained, by benefiting and rewarding those who are capable to impart it. Of the Norman barons, generally accounted the flower of Europe, Scotland received from time to time such numerous accessions, that they may be said, with few exceptions, to form the ancestors of the Scottish nobility, and of many of the most distinguished families among the gentry; a fact so well known that it is useless to bring proof of it. These foreigners, and especially the Normans and Anglo-Normans, were superior to the native subjects of the Scottish kings, both in the arts of peace and war. They therefore naturally filled their court, and introduced into the country where they were strangers their own manners and their own laws, which in process of time extended themselves to the other races by which Scotland was inhabited.

This intermixture gave a miscellaneous, and, in so far, an incoherent appearance to the inhabitants of Scotland at this period. They seemed not so much to constitute one state as a confederacy of tribes of different origin. Thus the charters of King David and his successors are addressed to all his subjects, French and English, Scottish and Galwegian. The manners, the prejudices of so many mixed races, corrected or neutralised each other; and the moral blending together of nations led in time, like some chemical mixture, to fermentation and subsequent purity. This was forwarded with the best intentions, though perhaps over hastily, and in so far injudiciously, by the efforts of the Scottish kings, who, from Malcolm Canmore's time to that of Alexander III, appear to have been a race of as excellent monarchs as ever swayed sceptre over a rude people. They were prudent in their schemes, and fortunate in the execution; and the exceptions occasioned by the death

[1153-1286 A.D.]

of Malcolm III and the captivity of William can only be imputed to chivalrous rashness, the fault of the age. They were unwearied in their exercise of justice, which in the more remote corners of Scotland could only be done at the head of an army; and even where the task was devolved upon the sheriffs and vice-sheriffs of counties, the execution of it required frequent inspection by the king and his high justiciaries, who made circuits for that purpose. The rights of landed property began to be arranged in most of the Lowland counties upon the feudal system then universal in Europe, and so far united Scotland with the general system of civilisation.

Spread of English Early Poetry

The language which was generally used in Scotland came at length to be English, as the speech of Lothian, the most civilised province of the kingdom and the readiest in which they could hold communication with their neighbours. It must have been introduced gradually, as is evident from the numerous Celtic words retained in old statutes and charters, and rendered general by its being the only language used in writing.

We know there was at least one poem composed in English by a Scottish author, which excited the attention of contemporaries. It is a metrical romance on the subject of *Sir Tristrem*, by Thomas of Erceldoune, who composed it in such "quaint English" as common minstrels could hardly understand or recite by heart. If we may judge of this work from the comparatively modern copy which remains, the style of the composition, brief, nervous, figurative, and concise almost to obscurity, resembles the Norse or Anglo-Saxon poetry more than that of the English minstrels, whose loose, prolix, and trivial mode of composition is called by Chaucer's Host of the Tabard, "drafty rhiming." The structure of the stanza in *Sir Tristrem* is also very peculiar, elliptical, and complicated, seeming to verify the high eulogy of a poet nearly contemporary, "that it is the best geste ever was or ever would be made, if minstrels could recite as the author had composed it." On the contrary, the elegiac ballad on Alexander III, already mentioned, differs only from modern English in the mode of spelling.

Besides the general introduction of the English language, which spread itself gradually, doubtless, through the more civilised part of the Lowlands, the Norman-French was also used at court, which, as we learn from the names of witnesses to royal charters, foundations, etc., was the resort of these foreign nobles. It was also adopted as the language of the coronation oath, which shows it was the speech of the nobles, while the version in Latin seems to have been made for the use of the clergy. The Norman-French also, as specially adapted to express feudal stipulations, was frequently applied to law proceedings.

The political constitution of Scotland had not as yet arranged itself under any peculiar representative form. The king acted by the advice, and sometimes under the control, of a great feudal council or *cour plénière*, to which vassals-in-chief of the crown and a part of the clergy were summoned. But there was no representation of the third estate. There was notwithstanding the spirit of freedom in the government; and though the institutions for its preservation were not yet finished in that early age, the great council failed not to let their voice be heard when the sovereign fell into political errors. We have already noticed that the liberties of the church were defended with a spirit of independence hardly equalled in any other state of Europe at the time.

Trade and the State of Society

The useful arts began to be cultivated. The nobles and gentry sheltered themselves in towers built in strong natural positions. Their skill in architecture, however, could not be extensive, since the construction of a handsome arch, even in Alexander the third's time, could only be accounted for by magic; and the few stately castellated edifices of an early date which remain in Scotland are to be ascribed to the English, during their brief occupation of that country.

Scotland enjoyed, during this period, a more extensive trade than historians have been hitherto aware of. Money was current in the country, and the payment of considerable sums, as ten thousand marks to Richard I, and on other occasions, was accomplished without national distress. The Scottish military force was respectable, since, according to Matthew Paris,⁴ Alexander II was enabled, in 1244, to face the power of England with a thousand horse, well armed and tolerably mounted, though not on Spanish or Italian horses, and nigh to one hundred thousand infantry, all determined to live or die with their sovereign.

The household of the Scottish king was filled with the usual number of feudal officers, and there was an affectation of splendour in the royal establishment, which even the humility of the sainted Queen Margaret did not discourage. She and her husband used at meals vessels of gold and silver plate, or, at least, says the candid Turgot,⁵ such as were lacquered over so as to have that appearance. Even in the early days of Alexander I, that monarch (with a generosity similar to that of the lover who presented his bride with a case of razors, as what he himself most prized) munificently bestowed on the church of Saint Andrews an Arabian steed covered with rich caparisons, and a suit of armour ornamented with silver and precious stones, all which he brought to the high altar, and solemnly devoted to the church.

Berwick enjoyed the privileges of a free port; and under Alexander III the customs of that single Scottish port amounted to £2,197, 8s., while those of all England only made up the sum of £8,411, 19s., 11½d. An ancient historian terms that town a second Alexandria.

Lastly, we may notice that the soil was chiefly cultivated by bondsmen; but the institution of royal boroughs had begun considerably to ameliorate the condition of the inferior orders.⁶

Cosmo Innes has said:

"When we consider the long and united efforts required, in the early state of the arts, for throwing a bridge over any considerable river, the early occurrence of bridges may be well admitted as one of the best tests of civilisation and national prosperity. If we reflect how few of these survived the middle of the fourteenth century, and how long it was, and by what painful efforts, before they could be replaced in later times, we may form some idea of the great progress in civilisation which Scotland had made during the reign of William, and the peaceful times of the two Alexanders. We do not know much of the intellectual state of the population during that age; but, regarding it only in a material point of view, it may safely be affirmed that Scotland, at the death of King Alexander III, was more civilised and more prosperous than at any period of her existence, down to the time when she ceased to be a separate kingdom in 1707."⁷

Such was the condition of Scotland at the end of the thirteenth century; but we only recognise laws and institutions in those parts of the kingdom

[ca. 1286 A.D.]

to which the king's immediate authority and the influence of the more modern system and manners extended. This was exclusive of the whole Highlands and isles, of Galloway, and Strathclyde, till these two last provinces were totally melted into the general mass of Lowland or Scoto-Saxon civilisation; and probably the northern provinces of Caithness and Moray were also beyond the limits of regular government. In other words, the improved system prevailed, in whole or in part, only where men, from comparative wealth and convenience of situation, had been taught to prefer the benefits of civilised government to the ferocious and individual freedom of a savage state. The mountaineers, as they did not value the protection of a more regular order of law, despised and hated its restraint. They continued to wear the dress, wield the arms, and observe the institutions or customs of their Celtic fathers. They acknowledged, indeed, generally speaking, the paramount superiority of the kings of Scotland; but many of their high chiefs, such as Macdonald of the Isles, Macdougall of Lorne, Roland of Galloway, and others, longed for independence, and frequently attempted to assert it. The king, on the other hand, could only exercise his authority in these remote districts directly by marching into them with his army, or indirectly by availing himself of their domestic quarrels, and instigating one chief to the destruction of another. In either case he might be the terror, but could never be esteemed the protector, of this primitive race of his subjects, the first, and for many years the only tribes over whom his fathers possessed any sway. And thus commenced, and was handed down for many an age, the distinction between the Celtic Scot and the Scoto-Saxon, the Highlander, in short, and Lowlander, which is still distinctly marked by the difference in language, and was long apparent by the distinction of manners, dress, and even laws.

Such was the singular state of Scotland, divided betwixt two separate races, one of which had attained a considerable degree of civilisation, and the other remained still nearly in a state of nature, when the death of Alexander III exposed the nation to the risk of annihilation as an independent people and kingdom.^d





CHAPTER IV

THE DAYS OF WALLACE

[1286-1305 A.D.]

In contemplating the history of Scotland it may be truly said: Had there been no Wallace, there would have been no Bruce; had there been no Stirling Bridge, there would have been no Bannockburn; and, it may be added, had there been no Bannockburn, there would, humanly speaking, have been no John Knox and no Scottish Reformation.—WILLIAM BURNS.^b

THE MAIDEN OF NORWAY AND THE DISPUTED SUCCESSION (1290 A.D.)

By the untimely decease of Alexander III, the Maiden of Norway, his granddaughter, remained sole and undoubted heir to the throne. Edward I of England, the near relation of the orphan queen, instantly formed the project of extending his regal sway over the northern part of Britain by a marriage betwixt this royal heiress and his only son, Edward prince of Wales. The great nobles of Scotland were, we have seen, Normans as well as the English lords: many held land in both kingdoms; and therefore the idea of an alliance with England was not at that time so unpopular as it afterwards became, when long and bloody wars had rendered the nations irreconcilable enemies. The Scottish took, on the other hand, the most jealous precautions that all the rights and immunities of Scotland, as a separate kingdom, should be upheld and preserved; that Scottishmen born should not be called to answer in England for deeds done in their own country; that the national records should be suffered to remain within the realm; and that no aids of money or levies of troops should be demanded, unless in such cases as were warranted by former usage. These preliminaries were settled between King Edward and a convention of the Scottish estates, held at Birgham, July, 1290. Edward promised all this and swore to his promise; but an urgent proposal that he should be put in possession of all the Scottish castles alarmed the estates of Scotland, as afford-

[1290-1291 A.D.]

ing too much cause to doubt whether oath or promise would be much regarded.

In the mean time Margaret, the young heiress of Scotland, died on her voyage to Scotland. A new scene now opened, for by this event the descendants of Alexander III, on whom the crown had been settled in 1284, were altogether extinguished, and the kingdom lay open to the claim of every one, or any one, who could show a collateral connection, however remote, with the royal family of Scotland. Many pretensions to the throne were accordingly set up; but the chief were those of two great lords of Norman extraction, Robert Bruce and John Baliol. The former of these was lord of Galloway, the latter of Annandale in Scotland. Their rights of succession stood thus:

William the Lion had a brother David, created earl of Huntingdon, who left three daughters; namely, 1. Margaret, married to Alan, lord of Galloway; 2. Isabella, to Robert Bruce, of Annandale; 3. Ada, to Henry Hastings. John Baliol claimed the kingdom as the son of Devorgoil, daughter of Margaret, the eldest daughter of David; Bruce, on the other hand, claimed as the son of Isabella, the second daughter, pretending that he was thus nearer by one generation to Earl David, through whom both the competitors claimed their relationship. The question simply was, whether the right of succession which David of Huntingdon might have claimed whilst alive descended to his grandson Baliol, or was to be held as passing to Bruce, who, though the son of the younger sister, was one degree nearer to the person from whom he claimed, being only the grandson, while Baliol was the great-grandson of Earl David, their common ancestor. Modern lawyers would at once pronounce in Baliol's favour, but the precise nature of representation had not then been fixed in Scotland.

Both barons resolved to support their plea with arms. Many other claims, more or less specious, were brought forward. The country of Scotland was divided and subdivided into factions; and in the rage of approaching civil war Edward I saw the moment when that claim of paramount superiority which had been so pertinaciously adhered to by the English monarchs, though as uniformly refuted by the Scottish, might be brought forward as the means of finally assuming the direct sway of the kingdom. He showed the extent of his ambitious and unjust purpose to his most trusty counsellors. "I will subdue Scotland to my authority," he said, "as I have subdued Wales."

The English monarch, one of the ablest generals and the most subtle and unhesitating politicians of his own or any other time, assembled an army on the borders, and communicated to the clergy and nobles of Scotland a peremptory demand, that, as lord paramount of the kingdom, he should be received and universally submitted to as sole arbiter in the competition for the crown. Split into a thousand factions, while twelve competitors were struggling for the crown, even the best and most prudent of the Scots seem to have thought it better to submit to the award of one of the wisest and most powerful monarchs of Europe, although at some sacrifice of independence, which they might regard as temporary and almost nominal, than to expose the country at once to civil war and the arms of England.

The nobility of Scotland therefore admitted Edward's claim, and accepted his arbitration. Twelve competitors stepped forward to assert their claims, and Edward, though he stated a right to the kingdom on his own part, as to a vacant fief which reverts to the sovereign, yet waived his claim with a species of affected moderation. Unquestionably his views were better served

[1291-1296 A.D.]

by dealing the cards, and sitting umpire of the game, than if he had mixed with the players. And there is little doubt that, far from desirous to insist on a claim which would have united all the competitors against him, he was sparing of no art which could embroil the question, by multiplying the number of claimants and exasperating them against each other. [Fuller details of these transactions have already been given in our History of England, Vol. XVIII, chapter 10.]

EDWARD I MAKES JOHN BALIOL KING; HIS REVOLT

The candidates solemnly acknowledged Edward's right as lord paramount of Scotland, and submitted their claims to his decision. The strengths and fortresses of the kingdom were put into the king of England's power (1291) to enable him to support, it was pretended, the award he should pronounce. After these operations had lasted several months, to accustom the Scots to the view of English governors and garrisons in their castles, and to disable them from resisting a foreign force, by the continued disunion which must have increased and become the more embittered the longer the debate was in dependence, Edward I, November 17th, 1292, preferred John Baliol to the Scottish crown, to be held of him and his successors, and surrendered to him the Scottish castles of which he held possession, being twenty in number.'

It was soon evident that the admission of the supremacy was only a part of Edward's object, and that he was determined so to use his right over Baliol as might force either him or Scotland into rebellion, and give the lord paramount a pretence to seize the revolted fief into his own hand.

In order to accomplish this, the king of England encouraged vexatious lawsuits against Baliol, for compelling his frequent and humiliating appearance as a suitor in the English courts of law. A private citizen of Berwick having appealed from a judgment of the commissioners of justice in Scotland, of which that town was then accounted part, Baliol, on this occasion, remonstrated against the appeal being entertained, reminding Edward that by the conditions sworn to at Birgham it was strictly covenanted that no Scottish subject should be called in an English court for acts done in Scotland. Edward replied, with haughty indifference and effrontery, that such a promise was made to suit the convenience of the time, and that no such engagements could prevent his calling into his courts the Scottish king himself, if he should see cause. His vassal, he said, should not be his conscience-keeper, to enjoin him penance for broken faith; nor would he, for any promise he had made to the Scots while treating of his son's marriage with Margaret, refrain from distributing the justice which every subject had a right to require at his hands. Baliol could only make peace with his imperious master by yielding up all stipulations and promises concerning the freedom and immunities of Scotland, and admitting them to be discharged and annulled.

Soon after this Duncan, the earl of Fife, being a minor, Macduff, his grand-uncle, made a temporary seizure of some part of the earldom. Macduff, being summoned to answer this offence before the Scottish estates, was condemned

[1 "So far as we can gather from the terms of the documents, it never seems to have occurred to the greedy litigants or their astute legal advisers that there was a fierce, self-willed people, nourished in independence and national pride, who must be bent or broken before the subtleties and pedantries of the lord superior's court could be of any avail. Totally unconscious, also, they seem to have been that the intricate technicalities which dealt with a sovereign independent state as a mere piece of property in search of an owner, formed an insult never to be forgiven, whatever might be the cost of repudiation and vengeance."—BURTON.c]

[1296-1296 A.D.]

by Baliol to a slight imprisonment. Released from his confinement, Macduff summoned Baliol to appear before Edward, and, in October, 1293, Edward directed that the Scottish king should answer by appearance in person before him. He came, but refused to plead. The parliament of England decreed that Baliol was liable to Macduff in damages, and for his contumacy in refusing to plead before his lord paramount, declared that three principal towns in Scotland, with their castles, should be taken into the custody of Edward until the king of Scots should make satisfaction. Severe and offensive regulations were laid down concerning the Scottish king's regular attendance in future on the courts of his suzerain in England. In a word, Baliol was made sensible that though he might be suffered for a time to wear sceptre and crown, it was but so long as he should consider himself a mere tool in the hands of a haughty and arbitrary superior, who was determined to fling him aside on the first opportunity, and to put every species of slight and dishonour on his right of delegated majesty till he should become impatient of enduring it. The Scottish king, therefore, determined to extricate himself from so degrading a position, and to free himself and his country from the thralldom of a foreign usurper. The time (1294) seemed apt to the purpose, for discord had arisen betwixt the realms of France and England concerning some feudal rights, in which Edward had shown himself as intractable and disobedient a vassal to Philip of France, as he was a severe and domineering superior to Baliol. Catching this favourable opportunity, Baliol formed a secret treaty of alliance with France,¹ signed at Paris, October 23rd, 1295.

Burton^c says of this treaty:

"This was a bargain for wasting, destroying, and slaying, rendered in terms which sound savage through the diplomatic formalities. The engagement was but too literally kept. One rabble army swept the western, and another the eastern border counties, pillaging, destroying, and burning, after the old fashion. Both returned without any achievement to give the mark of soldiership to their expedition. A course more wantonly impolitic for a country in Scotland's position could not well be devised." Burns,^b in answer, points to the notorious preparations of the English for an invasion of Scotland.^a

The Scottish nobles joined in the purpose of resistance, but declined to place Baliol at the head of the preparations which they made for national defence: and having no confidence either in his wisdom or steadiness, they detained him in a kind of honourable captivity in a distant castle, placing their levies under the command of leaders whose patriotism was considered less doubtful.

Edward, in 1296, put himself at the head of four thousand horse and thirty thousand infantry, the finest soldiers in Europe, and proceeded towards Northumberland. Anthony Beck, the military bishop of Durham, joined the royal host with a large body of troops. They besieged the town of Berwick, and took it by storm (March 30th), though gallantly defended. Thousands of the defenceless inhabitants were slain in the massacre which followed, and the town (a very wealthy one) was entirely plundered.¹ A body of thirty Flemish merchants held a strong building in the town, called the

[¹ Accounts of contemporaries differ widely on the number of slain. Langtoft^d puts it at four thousand, Fordun^e at seven thousand, Hemingburgh^f at eight thousand, Knighton^g at seventeen thousand, and Matthew^h of Westminster at sixty thousand, which Hailesⁱ wisely accepts as a copyist's error for six thousand. The massacre is recorded by the English chroniclers of the time as well as by the Scotch.]

[1296 A.D.]

Redhall, by the tenure of defending it against the English: they did so to the last, and honourably perished amid the ruins of the edifice.

Bruce the Competitor, the earl of March, and other Scottish nobles of the south, joined with King Edward, instead of opposing him. The first of these vainly flattered himself that the dethronement of Baliol might be succeeded by his own nomination to the crown, when it should be declared vacant by his rival's forfeiture, and Edward seemed to encourage these hopes. While the English king was still at Berwick, the abbot of Arbroath appeared before him with a letter from Baliol, in answer to Edward's summons to him to appear in person, renouncing his vassalage, and expressing defiance. "The foolish traitor!" said the king, "what frenzy has seized him? But since he will not come to us, we will go to him."

Edward's march northward was stopped by the strong castle of Dunbar, which was held out against him by the countess of March, who had joined the lords that declared for the cause of independence, although the earl, her husband, was serving in the English army: so much were the Scots divided on this momentous occasion. Whilst Edward pressed the siege of this important place, the inner gate, as it might be termed, of Scotland, a large force appeared on the descent of the ridge of the Lammermoor hills, above the town. It was the Scottish army moving to the relief of Dunbar, and on the appearance of their banners the defenders raised a shout of exultation and defiance. But when Warrenne, earl of Surrey, Edward's general, advanced towards the Scottish army, the Scots, with a rashness which often ruined their affairs before and afterwards, poured down from the advantageous post which they occupied, and incurred by their temerity a dreadful defeat, which laid the whole country open to the invader.

Bruce, after the victory of Dunbar, conceived his turn of triumph was approaching, and hinted to Edward his hope of being preferred to the throne which Baliol had forfeited. "Have we no other business," said Edward, looking at him askance, "than to conquer kingdoms for you?" Bruce retired and meddled no more with public affairs, in which his grandson, at a later period, took a part so distinguished.

After the battle of Dunbar scarce a spark of resistance to Edward seemed to enlighten the general despair. The English army continued an unresisted march as far north as Aberdeen and Elgin. Baliol, brought before his victor, [in the churchyard of Strathcaro, July, 1296] was literally stripped of his royal robes, confessed his feudal transgression in rebellion against his lord paramount, and made a formal surrender of his kingdom to the victor.

The king of England held a parliament at Berwick, August 28th, 1296, where he received the willing and emulous submission of Scottishmen of the higher ranks, lords, knights, and squires. Edward received them all graciously, and took measures for assuring his conquest. He created John Warrenne, earl of Surrey, guardian of Scotland. Hugh Cressingham, an ambitious churchman, was made treasurer, and William Ormesby justiciary of the kingdom. He placed English governors and garrisons in the Scottish castles, and returned to England, having achieved an easy and apparently a permanent conquest. This was not all. Edward resolved so to improve his conquest as to eradicate all evidence of national independence. He carried off or mutilated such records as might awaken the recollection that

[¹ The most important result of the campaign was the capture and fortification of Berwick. That city, the key to the Lothians, was the commercial city, and Scotland was left without one until the rise, after the union, of Glasgow and the mercantile centres of the Clyde.]

[1296 A.D.]

Scotland had ever been free. The chartulary of Scone, the place where, since the conquest of Kenneth Macalpine, the Scottish kings had been crowned, was carefully ransacked for the purpose of destroying whatever might be found at variance with the king of England's pretensions. The Scottish historians have, perhaps, magnified the extent of this rapine; but that Edward was desirous to remove everything which could remind the Scots of their original independence, is proved by his carrying to London, not only the crown and sceptre surrendered by Baliol, but even the sacred stone on which the Scottish monarchs were placed when they received the royal inauguration. He presented these trophies to the cathedral of Westminster.

This fatal stone, as already mentioned, was said to have been brought from Ireland by Fergus, the son of Eric, who led the Dalriads to the shores of Argyllshire. Its virtues are preserved in the celebrated leonine verse—

*Ni fallat fatum, Scoti, quocunque locatum
Invenient lapidem, regnare tenentur ibidem.*

Which may be rendered thus:—

*Unless the fates are faithless found,
And prophets' voice be vain,
Where'er this monument is found
The Scottish race shall reign.*

There were Scots who hailed the accomplishment of this prophecy at the accession of James VI to the crown of England, and exulted that, in removing this palladium, the policy of Edward resembled that which brought the Trojan horse in triumph within their walls, and which occasioned the destruction of their royal family. The stone is still preserved, and forms the support of King Edward the Confessor's chair, which the sovereign occupies at his coronation, and, independent of the divination so long in being accomplished, is in itself a very curious remnant of extreme antiquity.

The unanimous subjection of a proud and brave nation to a foreign conqueror is too surprising to be dismissed without remark, especially since it was so general that most of the noble and ancient families of Scotland are reduced to the necessity of tracing their ancestors' names in the fifty-six sheets of parchment which constitute the degrading roll of submission to Edward I. [This is called the Ragman Roll, a corruption probably of Ragment, a deed or convention.] The following circumstances here suggest themselves in explanation of the remarkable fact. The nobility of Scotland during the civil wars had, by the unvarying policy of Malcolm Canmore and his successors, come to consist almost entirely of a race foreign to the country. Two or three generations had not converted Normans into Scots; and whatever allegiance the emigrated strangers might yield to the monarchs who bestowed on them their fiefs, it must have been different from the sentiments of filial attachment with which men regard the land of their birth and that of their ancestors, and the princes by whose fathers their own had been led to battle, and with whom they had shared conquest and defeat.

In fact, the Normans were neither by birth nor manners rendered accessible to the emotions which constitute patriotism. Their ancestors were those Scandinavians who left without reluctance their native north in search of better settlements, and spread their sails to the winds, like the voluntary exile of modern times, little caring to what shores they were wafted, so that they were not driven back to their own. The education of the Normans of the thirteenth century had not inculcated that love of a natal soil which

they could not learn from their roving fathers of the preceding ages. They were, above all nations, devoted to chivalry, and its doctrines and habits were unfavourable to local attachment. The true knight-errant was a cosmopolite—a citizen of the world: every soil was his country, and he was indifferent to feelings and prejudices which promote in others patriotic attachment to a particular country.

The feudal system also, though the assertion may at first sight appear strange, had, until fiefs were rendered hereditary, circumstances unfavourable to loyalty and patriotism. A vassal might, and often did, hold fiefs in more realms than one; a division of allegiance tending to prevent the sense of duty or loyal attachment running strongly in any of their single channels. Nay, he might, and many did, possess fiefs depending on the separate kings of France, England, and Scotland, and thus being to a certain extent the subject of all these princes, he could hardly look on any of them with peculiar attachment, unless it were created by personal respect or preference. When war broke out betwixt any of the princes whom he depended upon, the feudatory debated with himself to which standard he should adhere, and shook himself clear of his allegiance to the other militant power by resigning the fief.

The possibility of thus changing country and masters, this habit of serving a prince only so long as the vassal held fief under him, led to loose and irregular conceptions on the subject of loyalty, and gave the feudatory more the appearance of a mercenary who serves for pay than of a patriot fighting in defence of his country. This consequence may be drawn from the frequent compliances and change of parties visible in the Scottish barons, and narrated without much censure by the historians. Lastly, the reader may observe that the great feudatories, who seemed to consider themselves as left to choose to which monarch they should attach themselves, were less regardful of the rights of England and Scotland, or of foreigners and native princes, than of the personal talents and condition of the two kings. In attaching themselves to Edward instead of Baliol, the high vassals connected themselves with valour instead of timidity, wealth instead of poverty, and conquest instead of defeat.

Such indifference to the considerations arising from patriotism, and such individual attention to their own interest being the characteristic of the Scoto-Norman nobles, it is no wonder that many of them took but a lukewarm share in the defence of their country, and that some of them were guilty of shameful versatility during the quickly changing scenes which we are about to narrate. It was different with the Scottish nation at large. ¹

THE RISE OF WALLACE

What King Edward gained by his own prudence, he lost by the negligence or imprudence of some of his officers. The earl of Warrenne lived chiefly in England, and the government of Scotland was left almost entirely to the treasurer, Cressingham, and the justiciary, Ormesby, who irritated the people, the one by his oppressive exactions, and the other by the severity with which he enforced the oath of fealty. The general discontent broke out in petty insurrections, and, in spite of the desertion of their nobility, the people of Scotland seemed to be animated by a general spirit of resistance. At first this feeling was shown by the numerous parties of outlaws and banditti who infested the roads, and plundered the English wherever they found them, sometimes burning and robbing their houses. These bands of maraud-

[1297 A.D.]

ers became gradually more numerous; they ventured even to attack castles, and to make prisoners of their garrisons; and they often committed atrocious acts of barbarity. Young men of respectable families, who had nothing to hope from the English government, and with whose wild and restless dispositions this lawless life agreed well, joined the insurgents and became their leaders. Among these was one who soon rose to the highest pitch of fame, and who was, for a while, looked upon with justice as the saviour of his country.

William Wallace (or de Walays) was the second son of Sir Malcolm Wallace of Ellerslie, near Paisley, a knight of small estate, but of an ancient family. Young Wallace was remarkable for his strength and stature; and, hasty and violent in his passions, he appears to have spent rather a turbulent youth. His hatred to the English was said to have been encouraged and fostered from his childhood by one of his uncles, a priest, who had perhaps suffered from the new state of things, and who instilled into the youthful mind of his nephew the love of freedom and the hatred of oppression. Wallace soon became a marked man in his native district, and he seems to have associated with men of the same temper and sentiments as his own, whose conduct was equally suspicious. According to popular history, he seems at this time to have lived a life worthy of Robin Hood and his foresters.

One day, in May, 1297, he was insulted by some English officers in the town of Lanark, and his resentment led to a street feud, in which he was overpowered, and would have been slain, but he escaped into the house of a woman who was his mistress, and by whose assistance he succeeded in making his escape to the woods in disguise."

This woman was an orphan, Marion Bradfute, and according to some accounts she and Wallace had been secretly married, and she had borne him a daughter; according to others, she was his betrothed; according to yet others, she was simply his mistress. Wyntoun⁹ calls her his "leman." Blind Harry's^r account agrees with Wyntoun's very closely, yet he would seem to have had some other narrative before him, and possibly Wyntoun and Harry may have drawn mainly upon a common predecessor. However this may be, Harry, with inflexible allegiance to his hero, expressly affirms: "Mine author says she was his rightwise wife." The point really needs no consideration.

Harry lavishes a wealth of tender emotion over the loves of Wallace and Marion Bradfute, and his sympathetic feeling elevates him to genuine poetic expression, often touched with extreme delicacy. Marion lived at Lanark, "a maiden mild" of eighteen. Her father, Sir Hugh de Bradfute, and her eldest brother, had been slain by Hazelrig, the sheriff of Lanark; her mother, too, was dead; and such peace as she enjoyed was dependent on her having "purchased King Edward's protection," although that did not secure her from the offensive attentions of his local minions.

"Amiable and benign she was, and wise,
Courteous and sweet, fulfilled of gentrice,
Her tongue well ruled, her face right fresh and fair.
Withal she was a maid of virtue rare:
Humbly her led, and purchased a good name,
And kept herself with every wight from blame.
True rightwise folk great favour did her lend."

When Wallace first saw her, Hazelrig had just broached a proposal of marriage between her and his son. The inevitable conflict arose.⁴

The English sheriff, Hazelrig, forced his way into the house, and cruelly put the woman to death; in revenge for which Wallace soon afterwards

[1297 A. D.]

attacked and slew the sheriff. Wallace was proclaimed a felon and traitor; a price was put on his head; and he was thenceforth obliged to make his home in the woods and mountains. There he found companions who had been already driven to the same course, and joining with these, he became the chief of one of the small plundering bands which overran the kingdom. Wallace's band was seldom unsuccessful in its enterprises; and the young hero already discovered a talent for war, which gained him distinction among other bands of outlaws, as well as with his own immediate followers. These gradually united themselves under his command, and he in a short time found himself at the head of a little army of outlaws whom he accustomed to discipline and obedience to their leader, as well as to those rapid and decisive movements which were necessary to insure success in the kind of warfare in which he was now engaged. He now openly declared war on the English, and he was joined by a few persons of more consequence, who hoped that they might thus assist in liberating their country from the English domination. Among the first of those was Sir William Douglas, a baron of influence in Clydesdale, who had been taken prisoner by the English at the siege of Berwick, and had been liberated on his taking the oath of fealty to King Edward.

The addition of the numerous vassals of Douglas to his already considerable force encouraged Wallace to attempt some bolder enterprise. It happened, fortunately for his design, that Ormesby, the English justiciary, was holding his court at Scone, with no great force to protect him, while the guardian of Scotland was attending the English parliament. Wallace marched suddenly to Scone in May, 1297, and surprised the justiciary, who escaped with difficulty, leaving a rich booty and many prisoners to the assailants. The latter now openly plundered and ravaged the country, putting all the English they found to the sword, and acting sometimes collectively, and sometimes in separate parties. They soon, however, collected all their forces into one army, and, leaving the scene of these exploits, threw themselves into the western districts of Scotland. This movement had, no doubt, been concerted with some of the great Scottish barons, who were weary of English rule, for Wallace had no sooner shown himself in the west than he was joined by the Steward of Scotland and his brother, Sir Andrew Moray, of Bothwell, Alexander de Lindesay, Sir Richard Lundin, Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, and other men of influence. The insurrection had now taken a formidable character, and Wallace, at the head of a considerable force, began to clear the districts in his power from the English. In doing this acts of great atrocity were daily perpetrated. The rage of the Scots was directed especially against the English clergy, and the victorious insurgents even amused themselves with torturing helpless women.

ROBERT BRUCE JOINS WALLACE

There was one man on whom all eyes were turned, and whose conduct had been hitherto indecisive. This was Robert Bruce, the son of Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale, who was at this time with King Edward. Young Robert Bruce was powerful by his extensive possessions, and by the number of ready vassals he could bring into the field, and he was looked on by the English rulers with so much suspicion that they summoned him to Carlisle, where he went with a numerous retinue, and made oath on the consecrated sacrament and the sword of Thomas à Becket, that he would be faithful to the king of England.

[1297 A.D.]

As a further proof of his zeal for the English government, he raised his own vassals, invaded and ravaged the lands of Wallace's companion, Sir William Douglas, and carried his wife and children prisoners into Annandale. Bruce had no sooner performed this exploit than he privately conferred with the retainers of his father, and tried, but in vain, to persuade them to rise and go with him to join the other insurgents against the English. Perhaps he felt that he had now too far compromised himself to remain any longer inactive, for he raised his own tenantry, and joined the standard of Wallace and Douglas.

The confederacy which had now formed round Wallace was, however, weak and uncertain. Success had given Wallace power, but the great barons who had joined in the revolt were ill contented to be serving under the banner of one who, without the set-off of high blood and extensive estates, stood proclaimed as an outlawed felon. Such was in no small degree the case with Bruce himself, whose ambition was stirred up by his own proximity to the throne, and his eye seems to have been directed constantly to the prize which John Baliol had carried off from his father. He had discovered that it was not likely to be the reward of his fidelity to King Edward, and he now thought that he might obtain it by serving his country.

Intelligence of this revolt reached King Edward as he was preparing to sail for Flanders, and although it excited his anger, he seems to have been too much convinced of the weakness and desolation of Scotland to imagine that it need give him any serious alarm. He commanded the Earl of Warrenne and Surrey, his guardian of Scotland, to march against his Scottish enemies. The earl was stricken with years, and was hardly equal to the quickness that was necessary in such an emergency; but he sent before him his nephew, Henry Percy, with an army of forty thousand foot and three hundred horse. The English, who seem to have looked at Bruce as the most important of their enemies, marched rapidly through Annandale to take possession of the castle of Lochmaberry. It was night when they arrived there, and the Scots, who had been watching their movements, took advantage of the darkness, and made a furious attack on their camp. The English set fire to the wooden houses in which they were lodged, and by this light repulsed their assailants. They then marched towards Ayr, to keep the men of Galloway in allegiance.

THE CAPITULATION AT IRVINE (1297 A.D.)

At break of day Percy led his army in the direction where he had been told that the Scottish army was posted, and after a march of three or four miles he discovered them drawn up at Irvine, on the banks of a small lake. This was the first time that the insurgents had faced a regular disciplined army, and the hearts of many of the leaders, who distrusted one another, suddenly failed them. Their principal anxiety seemed to be to make their peace with the English and save their estates. The Scots were equal in numbers to the English, and they had little to fear in risking a battle, had they been unanimous, but there was no unanimity among the insurgents. A Scottish knight—Sir Richard Lundi—who had hitherto resisted the English domination, set the example of desertion; he said there was no safety in a host which was divided against itself, and he went over with his men to the army of Henry Percy. Robert Bruce, the Steward of Scotland, Alexander de Lindesay, Sir William Douglas, the bishop of Glasgow, and others, followed his example; and all these chiefs affixed their signatures and seals to

[1297 A.D.]

an instrument in Norman French, in which they entreated forgiveness for their rebellion. It was dated at Irvine, on the 9th of July, 1297.

Wallace was indignant at the desertion of his noble allies; and, resolutely refusing to join in their submission, he placed himself at the head of his own faithful followers and as many of the others as would serve under him, and made his retreat towards the north. The only person of any note who accompanied him was Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell. The Treaty of Irvine was said to have been negotiated by the bishop of Glasgow, against whom the anger of Wallace was especially raised on this account; and he stopped in his retreat to wreak his vengeance on the prelate, by attacking his castle, ravaging his lands, and carrying his household into captivity.

The barons who thus submitted at Irvine seem to have been confounded at their own act; and although the king had accepted their submissions, they hesitated to send in their hostages, under pretence that they waited for some security that the liberties of their country should be preserved. Two, however, Sir William Douglas and the bishop of Glasgow, kept strictly to their engagements, and, finding they could not fulfil all the articles of the capitulation, they voluntarily surrendered their persons. The bishop seemed to have lost the confidence of all parties, and Edward looked even upon his surrender with suspicion, and seemed to think that he meditated treachery.

Robert Bruce had now become an object of more especial distrust, and he was only received into the king's peace after the bishop with the steward of Scotland and Alexander de Lindesay had agreed to be his sureties until he delivered his daughter Marjory as hostage. In spite of this outbreak, Edward, who was occupied with a continental war, continued to follow a conciliatory policy.

WALLACE WINS AT STIRLING BRIDGE (SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1297)

In the mean while Wallace in the north soon recruited his army, and recovered his confidence. The Scottish barons had deserted him, but most of their retainers, perhaps with the connivance of their lords, continued to follow his banner. The populace everywhere began to regard him as their protector and destined deliverer, and the army which looked upon him as its sole commander was increased rapidly during the summer months. He had already reduced the English garrisons who held the castles of Forfar, Brechin, and Montrose, and had driven them from nearly all the strongholds to the north of the Forth. He was commencing the siege of the strong castle of Dundee, when he received intelligence that the English army, under Warrenne and the treasurer Cressingham, was marching to Stirling on its way against him. With the army which now obeyed his command, and the ardour with which his successes had animated it, Wallace was not afraid to meet the enemy, and he knew that the ground about Stirling, if he could select his position, was more favourable than any spot he might have it in his power to choose for a tumultuous host to engage a disciplined army. He therefore marched southward with all his force after charging the citizens of Dundee with the siege of the castle, and threatening them with his utmost vengeance if they discontinued it; and he was fortunate enough to reach Stirling in time to make his dispositions before the English army arrived.

The English army was superior in number as well as in discipline to that opposed to it, for while but forty thousand foot and a hundred and eighty horse were said to have followed the banner of Wallace, Warrenne led into

[1297 A.D.]

the field a force of fifty thousand foot and a thousand horse.' But the English were embarrassed by the disagreement between their leaders, the earl and the treasurer Cressingham, the latter an overbearing ecclesiastic, who loved the profession of war better than the church, and who was hated by the Scots for his cruel tyranny. But for this cause, and for the earl's want of vigour, the English would, perhaps, have reached Stirling before Wallace. It was the passion of Cressingham to hoard up the king's revenue in his treasury, and he grudged the necessary expenses for the war. When the army marched towards Stirling, Henry Percy left Newcastle to join it, with a reinforcement of eight thousand foot and three hundred horse, but Cressingham ordered these troops to be disbanded, speaking of it as an unnecessary waste of the king's treasure, and declaring that they had men enough for their purpose.

The English army came in view of the Scots before Stirling on the 11th of September, and they found, to use the description of a contemporary chronicler, that there was not a better place in all Scotland for the defeat of a powerful army by a handful of men than that occupied by their enemies, whose force was concealed from their view by the nature of the ground. Instead of acting with the prudence which the knowledge of this circumstance ought to have insured, the English leaders showed a great want of caution. Warrenne and Cressingham seem to have imagined that the enemy would surrender with the same pusillanimity as at Irvine, and they delayed attacking the Scots until the Steward of Scotland, the earl of Lennox, and other Scottish barons who had accompanied the army, were sent to Wallace's camp to try to bring him to terms.

The whole course of the engagement which took place next day was a series of blunders on the part of the English commanders. By sunrise five thousand English footmen and a large body of Welsh soldiers had passed the bridge, but finding that they were unsupported, they repassed it. It was not till an hour after this that the earl of Warrenne awoke, and then the army was drawn up and some new knights were made. The Steward of Scotland and the earl of Lennox were seen approaching the camp. They informed the earl of Warrenne that they had made efforts to persuade Wallace to agree to terms of pacification, but without success, and that they could prevail upon none of his followers to desert him. The English soldiers had now become furious in their cries to be led on to the attack. The earl gave the order for passing the bridge. Sir Marmaduke Twenge, a knight of tried courage, with Cressingham himself, who was not wanting in the same quality, led them on, and when scarcely half the army had passed, Twenge, observing that the Scots still remained on the heights, and attributing their inactivity to fear, rashly gave the order to advance up the hill.

This was exactly the movement that Wallace desired. He had sent a part of his army by a circuitous route to possess themselves of the foot of the bridge, by which the communication between the two divisions of the English army was entirely cut off, and when he saw that this object had been effected, he ordered his men to attack the division under Twenge and Cressingham. The Scots rushed down impetuously from the hill upon the troops, which were already in disorder, and soon threw them into inextricable confusion. Among the first who fell was Cressingham the treasurer. Multi-

[Hume Brown^k thinks it incredible that either side should have had the number of men credited to it. It may be said in general of old accounts that exaggeration and diminution play a remarkable part. In such cases, however, we can do little but repeat with deprecation what records we have.]

[1297 A.D.]

tudes were slain around him; for the English soldiers seemed almost paralysed, and numbers of the heavy-armed horse threw themselves into the river, and were drowned in the attempt to swim over. The earl of Warrenne remained on the other side of the river, a spectator of the destruction of his men, and when he sent over the standard-bearers with another division, it was only to increase the disaster. Twenge, with one or two of his companions, cut his way through the columns opposed to him, and crossed the bridge to rejoin his commander; after which the bridge itself broke down, or was destroyed, thus rendering the fate of one portion of the army more helpless, although it facilitated the flight of the others. These, however, were exposed to an attack from new enemies; for when their allies, the earl of Lennox and the Steward of Scotland, who had, as was suspected, been in secret negotiation with Wallace, saw that their countrymen had the victory, they threw off the mask, and led on their followers to destroy and plunder the flying English. The English commander ordered Twenge to occupy the castle of Stirling, and then fled without halting till he reached Berwick, followed by what remained of his army.

Wallace's victory was complete. The loss on the side of the Scots was inconsiderable, but he had to lament the death of his faithful associate, Sir Andrew Moray. The English estimated their own loss at five thousand foot and a hundred horse, but in all probability it was much more considerable. The plunder which fell into the hands of the victors was immense. In their hatred of the English they made few or no prisoners, but slew all who fell into their hands, and they even indulged their fury by mutilating the dead. In their detestation of Cressingham, the Scottish soldiers threw themselves on his body, mangled it, and tore the flesh from his bones. His skin was taken off and cut to pieces, and it is even said that Wallace ordered a piece sufficient to make a sword-belt to be reserved.

The battle of Stirling was for a moment fatal to the English domination in Scotland. It struck terror into the English garrisons, and not only Dundee, but all the other fortresses in the kingdom, were surrendered to Wallace. He dismantled the castles of Edinburgh and Roxburgh, as though apprehensive that his triumph might not be lasting, and that they might again serve the purposes of Edward's tyranny. Even Berwick was deserted by its English garrison, and Wallace sent a Scottish knight, named Henry de Hali-burton, to take possession of it.

WALLACE INVADES ENGLAND (1297 A.D.)


Thus Wallace on a sudden found himself in full possession of the whole of Scotland. The Scottish chieftain determined to profit by the terror caused by his present success to invade the northern counties of England. He ordered for this purpose a general levy of soldiers throughout the kingdom; every county, barony, town, and village being required to send a certain proportion of its fighting men to march under his banner. In the execution of this order Wallace soon found how little substantial assistance he was likely to reap from the barons, who were already jealous of his power, and were unwilling to acknowledge for their superior a man of so mean an origin. The consequence was that Wallace's levies were made slowly and imperfectly.

Mortified at the lukewarmness of the nobles, most of whom remained at least professing allegiance to the English king, Wallace now proceeded to adopt measures of coercion, and, causing gibbets to be erected in each barony and county town, he threatened with death all who disobeyed his

[1297-1298 A.D.]

summons to join the army. Some burgesses of Aberdeen were hanged; but in general this threat seems to have produced its full effect, and he soon found himself at the head of a vast though disorderly host. With these, taking as his associate in command Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, the son¹ of the Moray who had been slain at the bridge of Stirling, he marched towards Northumberland. The population of that county, struck with terror, deserted their homes, and with their families, cattle, and household furniture, sought refuge in Newcastle. The Scots had sent their scouts before them, and by these they were informed of the flight of the inhabitants, and, as plunder was their main object, they put a stop to their march, as though they intended to proceed no farther.

But no sooner had the Northumbrians, imagining the danger was over, returned to their homes, than Wallace marched his army suddenly and rapidly across the border, and during several weeks the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland were plundered and ravaged in the most horrible manner. The county of Durham was only saved from the invaders by the approach of winter, which set in with such severity, and at the same time the scarcity of provisions became so great that multitudes of the Scots perished by cold and famine. Wallace thus found it necessary to retreat. Towards Christmas Lord Robert Clifford raised the men of Cumberland, and joining them with the strong garrison of Carlisle, had twice invaded Annandale, which he ravaged with fire and sword, in retaliation for the attack on the English border. The lands of Robert Bruce suffered on this occasion, and he made it a pretext for deserting the English party and joining Wallace.



RUINS OF ROSLIN CASTLE.

WALLACE IS MADE GUARDIAN OF SCOTLAND

Soon after Wallace's return to Scotland an assembly was held at the Forest Kirk, in Selkirkshire, which was attended by the earl of Lennox, Sir William Douglas, and other great barons, and their victorious leader was there elected governor or Guardian of Scotland, in the name of King John, for Baliol was still acknowledged by the Scots as their king. Wallace held this high office "with the consent of the community of Scotland." In fact, though the lesser barons and gentry now joined him in great number, the earls of Scotland and the greater barons still held aloof, and were unwill-

[¹ But Bain shows that the son was but a child at the time, and there is some uncertainty as to the identity of this Moray.]

[1298 A.D.]

ing to acknowledge his superiority. But Wallace now began to exert the authority which had been placed in his hands with vigour and prudence, though perhaps with a little leaning to tyranny, though this may be excused by the turbulence of the people he had to govern. His attention was especially directed to the military condition of the kingdom, and he divided it into military districts, ordering in each shire, barony, lordship, town, and burgh, a muster-book to be kept of the number of fighting men between the ages of sixteen and sixty, and from these he drew, under pain of heavy penalty, whatever recruits he considered necessary. He proceeded at the same time to introduce a stricter discipline into his army, and endeavoured to restrain the licentiousness of the soldiers. His firmness compelled the greater nobles to submit, at least in appearance, to his authority."

He also tried to revive trade, and a letter from him and Moray to the magistrates and commons of Lubeck and Hamburg is in existence, inviting them to resume their commerce with Scotland.^a

EDWARD INVADES SCOTLAND, AND WINS AT FALKIRK (1298 A.D.)

The English monarch was absent in Flanders when these events took place, and what was still more inconvenient, before he could gain supplies from his parliament to suppress the Scottish revolt, Edward found himself obliged to confirm Magna Charta, the charter of the forest, and other stipulations in favour of the people; the English being prudently though somewhat selfishly disposed to secure their own freedom before they would lend their swords to destroy that of their neighbours. Complying with these demands, Edward, on his return from the Low Countries, found himself at the head of a gallant muster of all the English chivalry, forming by far the most superb army that had ever entered Scotland. [He had more than 80,000 foot and 10,000 horse, according to some accounts.] Wallace acted with great sagacity, and, according to a plan which often before and after proved successful in Scottish warfare, laid waste the intermediate country between Stirling and the frontiers, and withdrew towards the centre of the kingdom to receive the English attack, when their army should be exhausted by privation.

Edward pressed on with characteristic hardihood and resolution. Tower and town fell before him; but his advance was not without such inconvenience and danger as a less determined monarch would have esteemed a good apology for retreat. His army suffered from want of provisions, which were at length supplied in small quantities by some of his ships. As the English king lay at Kirkliston, in West Lothian, a tumult broke out between the Welsh and English in his army, which, after costing some blood, was quelled with difficulty. While Edward hesitated whether to advance or retreat, he learned through the treachery of two apostate Scottish nobles (the earls of Dunbar and Angus) that Wallace, with the Scottish army, had approached so near as Falkirk. This advance was doubtless made with the purpose of annoying the expected retreat of the English. Edward, thus apprised that the Scots were in his vicinity, determined to compel them to action. He broke up his camp, and, advancing with caution, slept the next night in the fields along with the soldiers.

Next morning, July 22nd, 1298, the armies met. The Scottish infantry were drawn up on a moor, with a morass in front. They were divided into four phalanxes or dense masses,¹ with lances lowered obliquely over each

[¹ They were called "schiltrons" and were formed in circles. Hereford George^e called them "an important advance in the art of war."]

[1298 A.D.]

other, and seeming, says an English historian, like a castle walled with steel. These spear-men were the flower of the army, in whom Wallace chiefly confided. He commanded them in person, and used the brief exhortation, "I have brought you to the ring; dance as you best can."

The Scottish archers, under command of Sir John Stewart, brother of the Steward of Scotland, were drawn up in the intervals between the masses of infantry. They were chiefly brought from the wooded district of Selkirk. We hear of no Highland bowmen amongst them. The cavalry, which only amounted to one thousand men at arms, held the rear.

The English cavalry began the action. The marshal of England led half of the men at arms straight upon the Scottish front, but in doing so involved them in the morass. The bishop of Durham, who commanded the other division of the English cavalry, was wheeling round the morass on the east, and perceiving this misfortune, became disposed to wait for support. "To mass, bishop!" said Ralph Basset of Drayton, and charged with the whole body. The Scottish men at arms went off without couching their lances; but the infantry stood their ground firmly. In the turmoil that followed, Sir John Stewart fell from his horse, and was slain among the archers of Ettrick, who died in defending or avenging him. The close bodies of Scottish spearmen, now exposed without means of defence or retaliation, were shaken by the constant showers of arrows; and the English men at arms finally charging them desperately while they were in disorder, broke and dispersed these formidable masses. The Scots were then completely routed, and it was only the neighbouring woods which saved a remnant from the sword. The body of Stewart was found among those of his faithful archers, who were distinguished by their stature and fair complexions from all others with which the field was loaded. Macduff and Sir John the Grahame, "the hardy wight and wise," still fondly remembered as the bosom friend of Sir William Wallace, were slain in the same disastrous action.

Popular report states this battle to have been lost by treachery; and the communication between the earls of Dunbar and Angus and King Edward, as well as the disgraceful flight of the Scottish cavalry without a single blow, corroborates the suspicion. But the great superiority of the English in archery may account for the loss of this as of many another battle on the part of the Scots. The bowmen of Ettrick Forest were faithful, but they could only be few. So nearly had Wallace's scheme for the campaign been successful, that Edward, even after having gained this great battle, returned to England, and deferred reaping the harvest of his conquest till the following season. If he had not been able to bring the Scottish army to action, his retreat must have been made with discredit and loss, and Scotland must have been left in the power of the patriots.

WALLACE RESIGNS THE GUARDIANSHIP; THE POPE CLAIMS SCOTLAND

The slaughter and disgrace of the battle of Falkirk might have been repaired in other respects; but it cost the Scottish kingdom an irredeemable loss in the public services of Wallace. He resigned the Guardianship of the kingdom, 'unable to discharge its duties, amidst the calumnies with which faction

[¹ Some have denied that Wallace resigned his authority and retired to France, but it is generally accepted. As an example of old exaggeration we may quote the English chronicler Hemingburgh, who states that 850,000 Scots were killed or captured at Falkirk, which, as Burns ² notes, is "more than the entire adult male population of Scotland capable of bearing arms in the nineteenth century."]

[1296-1303 A.D.]

and envy aggravated his defeat. The bishop of Saint Andrews, Bruce, earl of Carrick, and Sir John Comyn were chosen Guardians of Scotland, which they administered in the name of Baliol. In the mean time that unfortunate prince was, in compassion or scorn, delivered up to the pope by Edward, and a receipt was gravely taken for his person from the nuncio then in France. This led to the entrance of a new competitor for the Scottish kingdom.

The pontiff of Rome had been long endeavouring to establish a claim, as if he had been lord of the manor of all Christendom, to whatsoever should be therein found to which a distinct and specific right of property could not be ascertained. His claim to the custody of the dethroned king being readily admitted, Boniface VIII was encouraged to publish a bull, claiming Scotland as a dependency on the see of Rome, because the country had been converted to Christianity by the reliques of Saint Andrew. The pope in the same document took the claim of Edward to the Scottish crown under his own discussion, and authoritatively commanded Edward I to send proctors to Rome, to plead his cause before his holiness.

This magisterial requisition was presented by the archbishop of Canterbury to the king, in the presence of the council and court, the prelate at the same time warning the sovereign to yield unreserved obedience since Jerusalem would not fail to protect her citizens, and Mount Zion her worshippers. "Neither for Zion nor Jerusalem," said Edward, in towering wrath, "will I depart from my just rights, while there is breath in my nostrils." Accordingly he caused the pope's bull to be laid before the parliament of England, who unanimously resolved, "that in temporals the king of England was independent of Rome, and that they would not permit his sovereignty to be questioned." Their declaration concludes with these remarkable words: "We neither do, will, nor can permit our sovereign to do anything to the detriment of the constitution which we are both sworn to, and are determined to maintain." A spirited assertion of national right, had it not been in so bad a cause as that of Edward's claim of usurpation over Scotland.

Meantime the war languished during this strange discussion, from which the pope was soon obliged to retreat. There was an inefficient campaign in 1299 and 1300. In 1301 there was a truce, in which Scotland as well as France was included. After the expiry of this breathing space, Edward I, in the spring of 1302, sent an army into Scotland of twenty thousand men, under Sir John de Segrave, a renowned general. He marched towards Edinburgh in three divisions, leaving large intervals between each. While in this careless order, Segrave's vanguard found themselves suddenly within reach of a small but chosen body of troops, amounting to eight thousand men, commanded by Sir John Comyn, the guardian, and a gallant Scottish knight, Sir Simon Fraser. Segrave was defeated, but the battle was scarce over when his second division came up. The Scots, flushed with victory, re-established their ranks, and having cruelly put to death their prisoners, attacked and defeated the second body also. The third division came up in the same manner. Again it became necessary to kill the captives, and to prepare for a third encounter. The Scottish leaders did so without hesitation, and their followers, having thrown themselves furiously on the enemy, discomfited that division likewise, and gained, as their historians boast, three battles in one day.

But the period seemed to be approaching in which neither courage nor exertion could longer avail the unfortunate people of Scotland. A peace with France, in which Philip the Fair totally omitted all stipulations in favour of his allies, left the kingdom to its own inadequate means of resist-

[1303-1305 A.D.]

ance, while Edward directed his whole force against it. The castle of Brechin, under the gallant Sir Thomas Maule, made an obstinate resistance. He was mortally wounded, and died in an exclamation of rage against the soldiers, who asked if they might not then surrender the castle. Edward wintered at Dunfermline, and began the next campaign (1303) with the siege of Stirling, the only fortress in the kingdom that still held out. But the courage of the guardians altogether gave way; they set the example of submission, and such of them as had been most obstinate in what the English king called rebellion were punished by various degrees of fine and banishment.¹

With respect to Sir William Wallace, it was agreed that he might have the choice of surrendering himself unconditionally to the king's pleasure, provided he thought proper to do so; a stipulation which, as it signified nothing in favour of the person for whom it was apparently conceived, must be imputed as a pretext on the part of the Scottish nobles to save themselves from the disgrace of having left Wallace altogether unthought of. Some attempts were made to ascertain what sort of accommodation Edward was likely to enter into with the bravest and most constant of his enemies; but the demands of Wallace were large, and the generosity of Edward very small. The English king broke off the treaty, and put a price of three hundred marks on the head of the patriot.

Meantime Stirling Castle continued to be defended by a slender garrison, and, deprived of all hopes of relief, continued to make a desperate defence, [as described in our history of England], under its brave governor, Sir William Olifaunt, until famine and despair compelled him to an unconditional surrender, in 1304, when the king imposed the harshest terms on this handful of brave men.¹

THE CAPTURE AND EXECUTION OF WALLACE (AUGUST 23D, 1305)

Wallace was now living the life of an outlaw in the wilds of the north. Here he long eluded the pursuit of his enemies, and might perhaps never have fallen into their hands had he not been betrayed by his own people. Wallace was hated by the Scottish nobles, not only because they looked upon him as an upstart, but because, when in power, he appears to have acted towards them with a proud, unconciliating bearing. They, therefore, were far from unwilling to deliver him up to the king's vengeance, if he fell into their hands. Many, also, of lower rank were ready to betray him, some with no better motive than the desire of obtaining the reward which was set upon his head.

Among Wallace's personal enemies was Sir John Menteith, a Scottish baron of high rank, whose nephew was slain fighting under that chieftain's banner at Falkirk. It is supposed that Menteith had cherished a feud against Wallace ever since that fatal battle, because he had retreated from the field and left his nephew to perish. Sir John Menteith was, at this time, sheriff of Dumbartonshire, and he joined the authority of his office with the activity of a personal enemy in tracing Wallace from one hiding-place to another. At length a treacherous servant of the fugitive gave information of the place

[¹During these ten years, not to speak of mere detachments, convoys, escorts, reinforcements, or garrisons, no fewer than twelve invading armies, consisting of Normans, Saxons, Welsh, and Irish, aided by Gascons from the south of France, and even Savoyards from the marches of Italy, had been poured across the Scottish border. Several of these armies exceeded in numbers that with which William of Normandy conquered Saxon England.—WM. BURNS.]

[1305 A.D.]

of his retreat, and Menteith, having surrounded the house in which he was concealed, found him in bed "with his leman," and carried him off a prisoner.

He was immediately sent to London in fetters, where he was paraded triumphantly through the streets, and, in due course, was arraigned in Westminster Hall of high treason; and as it was reported that he had once boasted himself worthy to wear a crown in that place, a crown of laurel was placed in mockery on his head. He insisted upon his innocence of the disgraceful crime of treason, on the ground that he had never sworn fealty to the king of England, but he acknowledged that he had made war against him in defence of the independence of his country.

As might be expected, the Scottish hero was found guilty of everything that was laid to his charge, and he was condemned to suffer the death of a traitor. Upon this the laurel crown was taken from his head, and he was chained; and on the 23rd of August the sentence was carried into execution."

Matthew of Westminster^b (*Flores Historiarum*) describes him as "Willelmus Waleis, a man void of pity, a robber given to sacrilege, arson, and homicide, more hardened in cruelty than Herod, more raging in madness than Nero," who was "condemned to a most cruel but justly deserved death. He was drawn through the streets of London at the tails of horses, until he reached a gallows of unusual height, especially prepared for him; there he was suspended by a halter; but taken down while yet alive, he was mutilated, his bowels torn out and burned in a fire, his head then cut off, his body divided into four, and his quarters transmitted to four principal parts of Scotland. Behold the end of the merciless man, who himself perishes without mercy!"^a

The four quarters of Wallace's body were stuck up at Newcastle, Berwick, Perth, and Aberdeen. His head was placed on a pole on London Bridge. Thus ignominiously perished the man whom Scotland has ever revered as one of the purest and bravest of her patriots; though, under the mistaken feelings and prejudices of that age, the people of England exulted over his fate as that of an accursed felon, and shouted songs of exultation over his quivering remains. The refined cruelty of his death, though in accordance with the sanguinary laws of that period, casts a dark blot on the character of one of the greatest of the English monarchs."

FREEMAN'S ESTIMATE OF WILLIAM WALLACE

I speak of the wars of Wallace and Bruce as revolts. Their revolts may, like many other revolts, have been justifiable, but they were revolts. Neither of them, Bruce far less than Wallace, was resisting an invader. As for William Wallace, we need not look upon him either as the faultless hero which he appears in Scottish romance, nor yet as the vulgar ruffian which he appears in English history. His tenure of power in Scotland was very short, but for a man who started, as he did, from nothing, to rise, even for a moment, to the command of armies, and even to the government of the kingdom, shows that he must have possessed some very great qualities. That the great nobles mostly shrank from him, or supported him very faintly, is rather to his credit; it sets him forth more distinctly as a national champion. On the other hand, it is impossible to deny the fiendish brutalities practised by him in England.

He could now hardly look for the mercy which he had scorned. In the eyes of Edward and of every Englishman he was simply a traitor, robber, murderer of the blackest dye. On such men the law took its course in 1305, just as it did in 1745.^p

[1305 A.D.]

ESTIMATES OF WALLACE BY BURTON, MURISON, AND ROSEBERY

This great man has stood forth for six centuries, and will in all probability stand forth forever, as incomparably the most heroic and most fateful figure in the history of Scotland—a hero and a patriot second to none in the recorded history of the nations.

Burton^c acknowledges freely that Wallace was “a man of vast political genius.” The particulars are most limited, and yet they are ample to ground a large inference. It will be sufficient to recall his endeavours, in the midst of warlike activity, to resuscitate industry and commerce, to reorganise the civil order, to secure the aid of France and Rome, to minimise the friction with the barons, and to observe and to enforce deference to constitutional principle. It is a striking testimony to his greatness of mind that he was absolutely destitute of ambition, as ambition is ordinarily understood. Even at the height of his power and popularity, he does not seem to have had the faintest impulse to seize the crown, or, indeed, to seize anything for himself. It is a singularly bright leaf in Wallace’s laurels that there remains no shadow of evidence of any inclination on his part to swerve from the straight course of pure and unselfish patriotism.

Beyond and above the exceptional tribute of “vast political and military genius”—a tribute doubly ample for any one man in any century of a nation’s history—it is the unique glory of Wallace that he was the one man of his time that dared to champion the independence of his country.¹ More than that, though he died a cruel and shameful death amidst the exultant insults of his country’s foes in the capital city of the enemy, he yet died victorious. He had kept alight the torch of Scottish freedom. He, a man of the people, had taught the recreant nobles that resistance to the invader was not hopeless, although those that took the torch immediately from his hand failed to carry it on; and the light was preserved by the commonalty till the torch was at length grasped by Bruce. Wallace, in fact, had made the ascendancy of Bruce possible—a possibility converted into a certainty by the death of Edward I.

Lord Rosebery^t has justly pointed to the attitude of Edward towards him in 1304 as “the greatest proof of Wallace’s eminence and power.” “The true deliverer of Scotland was Sir William Wallace.”

The prime consideration is very finely singled out and expressed by Lord Rosebery:

“There are junctures in the affairs of men when what is wanted is a Man—not treasures, not fleets, not legions, but a Man—the man of the moment, the man of the occasion, the man of destiny, whose spirit attracts and unites and inspires, whose capacity is congenial to the crisis, whose powers are

[¹ So Robert Burns exclaims:

“At Wallace’ name what Scottish blood
But boils up in a springtide flood?”


And the English Wordsworth has paid this tribute in his *Prelude*:

“I would relate
How Wallace fought for Scotland; left the name
Of ‘Wallace’ to be found, like a wild flower,
All over his dear country; left the deeds
Of Wallace, like a family of ghosts,
To people the steep rocks and river banks,
Her natural sanctuaries, with a local soul
Of independence and stern liberty.”]

[1805 A.D.]

equal to the convulsion—the child, and the outcome of the storm. We recognise in Wallace one of these men—a man of fate given to Scotland in the storms of the thirteenth century. It is that fact, the fact of his destiny and his fatefulness, that succeeding generations have instinctively recognised.”

If it is fundamentally due to Wallace’s heroic heart and mind that the national spirit of freedom saved Scotland from union with England, on any terms less dignified than the footing of independence, then the results of his noble struggle entitle him to a foremost place among the great men that have established the foundations of the British Empire. One sovereign, at least, of England, as well as of Scotland, acknowledged—and handsomely acknowledged—“the good and honourable service done of old by William Wallace for the defence of that our kingdom.” Wallace made Scotland great; and, as Lord Rosebery proudly and justly claimed, “if Scotland were not great, the empire of all the Britains would not stand where it does.” In the work of imperial expansion, consolidation, and administration, Scotsmen have done, and are doing, at least their fair share; but that share would have been indefinitely deferred, and indefinitely marred, but for the uncurbed passion of freedom pervading their nature. And to Scotsmen, in all the generations, freedom will ever be nobly typified in the immortal name of Sir William Wallace.*





CHAPTER V

ROBERT BRUCE

[1305-1331 A.D.]

Thus was Edward possessed of Scotland, which nevertheless (that the world might see God's hand in translating of kingdomes, being a point of his prerogative) was not long after pluckt from his sonne, and the calamities which the Scots had suffered whelmed back upon the English, which peculiar art of Divine Providence you will more easily acknowledge, when you shall behold by how naked an instrument he raised againe the Scottish commonwealth out of that dust, in which, for a little season, it seemed to lye buried.—JOHN SPEED.^b

WALLACE was dead. His body was disfigured and distributed in the great centres of his activity and influence, as an encouragement to English sympathisers and a sign of retribution to Scots that might yet cherish the foolishness of patriotism. The moral has been well rendered by Burton^c:

"The death of Wallace stands forth among the violent ends which have had a memorable place in history. Proverbially such acts belong to a policy that outwits itself. But the retribution has seldom come so quickly, and so utterly in defiance of all human preparation and calculation, as here. Of the bloody trophies sent to frighten a broken people into abject subjection, the bones had not yet been bared ere they became tokens to deepen the wrath and strengthen the courage of a people arising to try the strength of the bands by which they were bound, and, if possible, break them once and for ever."

Wallace had done his work right well and truly, as builder of the foundations of Scottish independence. He had sealed his faith with his blood. Probably he died despairing of his country. Yet barely had six months come and gone when his dearest wish was fulfilled.^d

To settle the government of his late acquisition, Edward condescended to ask and follow the advice of three Scotsmen, Robert Bruce, the successor of

[1305 A.D.]

Bruce the competitor for the crown, and Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, and John Mowbray, both of whom had distinguished themselves by their previous attachment to the cause of independence. At their suggestion he summoned a Scottish parliament at Perth (May 28th, 1305), in which ten commissioners were chosen to confer with the king in person at London. To them were joined ten Englishmen, with several of the judges, and all took an oath to give the best advice in their power, without suffering themselves to be swayed by any consideration of friendship, enmity, or interest.

The result of their deliberation was, on September 23rd: that John de Bretagne [or Brittany], Edward's nephew, should be appointed Guardian of the realm, with the aid of the present chamberlain and chancellor, both Englishmen; that for the better administration of justice, Scotland should be divided into four districts, to each of which two justiciaries, the one a native, the other an Englishman, were assigned; and that Bruce should intrust the castle of Kildrummy to a person for whose fidelity he should be responsible.^m

Edward's recent biographer, T. F. Tout,^e has said of this settlement:

"Admitting that Scotland was to be ruled by Edward at all, it is hard to see how the government of Scotland could have been better arranged than by this plan."

And the Scotch historian Burton^c also says:

"It bears the impression of a high intelligence and foresight, mellowed by beneficence, and even kindness. The author of it saw that, once brought together, without violence, or goading to national antipathy, the two nations would naturally co-operate and fuse into one compact empire; and no one could be more alive to the mighty destinies that such an empire might have to look to." Elsewhere he writes: "In truth Edward's leniency was one of the examples of a new policy towards Scotland which experience had taught him. Strengthening his hand to the utmost, he would yet lay it on gently, if not winningly. He was no Nero or Domitian, luxuriating in the lust of power, and besotting himself with bloody orgies. His ambition was to be an organiser and reformer; in his own way, a benefactor to his race, and this passion was the real source of his severities. He saw before him the splendid vision of the British Isles under one scheme of strong, orderly government, blessing all classes of the community; and his fury when thwarted—his rage against the self-willed barbarians who baffled his wise projects, drove him to cruelty."

This settlement was followed by an act of conditional indemnity. All who had engaged in the rebellion and afterwards submitted, were secured as to life and limb, and freed from imprisonment and disherison, on condition that they paid certain fines: the clergy one year's rent of their estates; Comyn, Gordon, and the bishop of Glasgow, three years'; William Baliol, Simon Fraser, and John Wishart, four years', and Ingelram de Umfraville, five years' rent. At the same time the order of temporary banishment against Comyn, Graham, and the bishop of Glasgow was recalled. The money arising from these fines was to be spent in Scotland, for the benefit of the kingdom. If it be considered that these men had given repeated proofs of their hostility to Edward, that they had sworn fealty to him and renounced it, had renewed their oaths and broken them again, we shall discover more reason to applaud his moderation than to accuse his severity. Take for example Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, of whom Edward complains to the pope that, after the forfeiture of Baliol, he swore fealty three times on "the body of Christ, the holy gospels, the cross Neot, and the black cross of Scotland," and yet joined Bruce and Wallace; was pardoned and swore fealty again.

[1305 A.D.]

again rebelled and was pardoned: swore fealty a fifth time and rebelled and was pardoned (see Palgrave). He now swore fealty a sixth time, and kept his oath till Bruce assumed the crown, when he broke it again. The world has seen many conquerors; but it will be difficult to find one who with such provocation has displayed an equal degree of lenity.^m

Scotland, therefore, might be said to be entirely reduced, and Edward flattered himself that he was now in quiet to enjoy that sovereignty which had been purchased by a war of fifteen years, and at an incredible expense of blood and treasure. In less than six months from the execution of Wallace, this new system of government was entirely overthrown and Scotland was once more free.^o

THE EARLY VACILLATIONS OF ROBERT BRUCE

Robert Bruce, no doubt, took his name from a Norman ancestor, a De Brus, who came in with the Conquest. The very first in succession, however, married a Scottish "heiress of Annandale," whereby the family became Scottish barons as early as the reign of Alexander I. It is said that Robert's actual birth occurred at Westminster, in England, but this is very doubtful. Be that as it may, the accident of his birth did not change the fact that the parents of the future king were domiciled Scottish subjects. How far he was influenced by patriotism, and how far by ambition, may be a difficult question to determine; but to speak of him as a "Norman adventurer in search of a crown," or as an English subject of Edward, owing no duty to his Scottish brethren, is merely to juggle with words. In every point of view he was more a Scotsman than Edward was an Englishman.^b

Robert Bruce was put in possession of the earldom of Carrick by the resignation of his father in 1293. About this time Baliol, king of Scotland, had declared war against England; but none of the Bruce family joined him on that occasion. They continued to regard their own chief the elder Bruce's title to the crown as more just than that of Baliol. The oldest Bruce, indeed, as we have just noticed, nourished hopes that Edward would have preferred him to the crown on the deposition of his rival; but checked by the scornful answer of the monarch, that he had other business than conquering kingdoms for him, he retired to his great Yorkshire possessions, yielding his Scottish estates to the charge of his grandson, who showed at this early period, when a youth of two or three-and-twenty, a bold, bustling, and ambitious, but versatile disposition of mind. He had a natural spirit of ill-will against the great family of Comyn, because John Comyn of Badenoch had married Marjory, the sister of John Baliol. So that when Baliol's title was ended by his resignation, and the foreign residence and youth of his son placed him out of the question, John, called the Red Comyn, the son of John Comyn of Badenoch and Marjory Baliol, had, through his mother, the same title to the throne as that which had been preferred on the part of John Baliol: and the Comyns' claim, as Baliol's, in the last generation, then stood in direct opposition to that on which the Bruces rested as descendants from Isabella, second daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon.

But, besides the emulation which divided these two great families touching the succession of the crown, there had private injuries passed between them of a nature which, in that haughty age, were accounted deserving of persevering and inveterate vengeance. The lords who joined John Baliol in his revolt from Edward had issued a hasty order, confiscating the rich property of Annandale, because Bruce had not obeyed their summons. His domains

[1297-1303 A.D.]

were granted by John Baliol to Comyn, earl of Buchan, and Bruce's castle of Lochmaben was occupied by him accordingly.

The necessary consequence was, that suspicion and hatred divided the heads of the two rival houses, and rendered it almost impossible for them to concur in any joint effort for their country's liberty, because, when that freedom should be achieved, they could not expect to agree which of them should be placed at the head of affairs. During the insurrection of Wallace, the younger Bruce acted, as we have seen, with more than usual versatility. He took every oath that could be suggested in attestation of his faith to the king of England, showed his zeal by plundering the lands of William of Douglas, the associate of Wallace, carried that baron's wife and family away prisoners; and having done all this to evince his faith to Edward, he united himself to Wallace and his associates. Once more Bruce saw reason to repent the part he had taken, again swore fealty, and gave his infant daughter as a hostage for keeping his faith in future.⁴

"The breaking of an oath," says Burton,^c "has an ugly sound, and is not to be lightly spoken of; yet, like all other offences, it has to be measured by the special conditions of the time."

And Burns^b says: "In the first place, the church claimed to dispense with almost every duty, public or private. It exercised the power of 'absolving' from the most sacred obligations, even when confirmed by solemn oaths. Under the feudal system every transaction between superior and vassal was made an occasion for homage and oaths of fealty, without taking account of the constantly recurring emergencies wherein such oaths were no longer considered binding. In short, an oath had ceased to be in fact what it might be in theory; and, in forming an estimate of the character of any historical personage, we must bear in mind the conditions of the time in this respect, just as we require to do with reference to the manner of carrying on war in the feudal ages. The very writers who so persistently denounce Robert Bruce do not hesitate to extol Harold as a patriot hero beyond reproach, without inquiring too minutely what share personal ambition had in his motives."

He permitted himself to be joined in the Scottish commission of regency, of which his rival, John the Red Comyn, was a distinguished member, having commanded, as we observed, at the memorable battle of Roslin. Upon the pacification between Edward and the Scots, and the death of his father in 1304, Bruce was permitted to take possession of his paternal estates, while Comyn, as the greater delinquent in English eyes, was subjected to a severe fine.

In 1304 Bruce enjoyed the favour and confidence of King Edward, and was one of those in whom that sagacious monarch chiefly trusted for securing Scotland to his footstool forever. Such, however, was far from being the intention of the young earl of Carrick. Though we can but obscurely trace what his purpose really was, this much is certain—a great object now presented itself, which formerly was not open to Bruce's ambition. In the insurrection of Wallace, and the subsequent stand made after the battle of Falkirk by the commissioners of regency, the name of John Baliol had always been used as the head and sovereign of Scotland, in whose right its natives were in arms, and for whom they defended their country against the English. It was probably the high influence of the Comyns, his near connections, which kept the claims of Baliol so long in the public eye. But, in his disgraceful renunciation, followed by a long absence from Scotland, after renouncing every exertion to defend his kingdom, the king, Toom-tabard,

[1304-1306 A.D.]

i.e., Empty Coat, as he was termed by the people, lost all respect and allegiance among his subjects. The crown of Scotland was therefore open to any daring claimant who might be disposed to brave the fury of the English usurper; and such a candidate might have rested, with some degree of certainty, upon the general feeling of the Scottish nation, and upon that disaffection which, like a strong ground-swell, agitated both the middle classes and populace throughout the country, who were disposed, from the spirit of independence with which they were animated, to follow almost any banner which might be displayed against England.

In this conjuncture Bruce entered into a secret treaty with William de Lambyrton, the primate of Scotland, binding themselves to stand by each other against all mortals (the king of England not being excepted). It was thought necessary to discover this league to John Comyn; or, perhaps, he had been led to suspect it, and such a communication had become unavoidable on the part of the conspirators. Comyn was given to understand that the purpose of the league was the destruction of the English supremacy in Scotland. The question was natural, "And what king do you intend to propose?" To this Bruce, in a personal conference with John Comyn, is said to have pointed out to him that their claims to the throne might be considered as equal; "therefore," said Bruce, "do you support my title to be king of Scots, and I will surrender my patrimonial estates to you; or give over to me your family possessions, and I will support your claim to the throne." Comyn, it is said by the Scottish historians, ostensibly embraced the alternative of taking Bruce's large property, and asserting his claim to royalty. But in secret he resolved to avail himself of this discovery to betray the intrigues of his rival to Edward.

BRUCE KILLS HIS RIVAL, THE RED COMYN (1306 A.D.)

Robert Bruce had returned to London, and was in attendance on the English court, when a private token from the earl of Gloucester, his kinsman, made him aware that his safety and liberty were in danger. It is said the earl of Gloucester sent Bruce a piece of money and a pair of spurs. Men's wits are sharpened by danger, and slighter intimations have been sufficient in such circumstances to put them on their guard, and induce them to take measures for their safety when peril hovered over them. He left London instantly, and hastened to Scotland.¹ It is said that near the Solway Sands Bruce and his attendants met an emissary of Comyn, who was despatched, they found, for the English court. They killed the messenger without hesitation, and from the contents of his packet learned the extent of Comyn's treachery. In five days Bruce reached his castle of Lochmaben.

It was on February 10th, 1306; and the English justiciaries appointed by Edward's late regulations for preservation of the peace of the country of Scotland were holding their assizes at Dumfries for that purpose. Bruce, not yet prepared for an open breach with England, was under the necessity of rendering attendance on this high court as a crown vassal, and came to the county-town for that purpose. He here found Comyn, whom the same duty had brought to Dumfries. Bruce invited his rival to a private interview, which was held in the church of the Friars Minorite; a precaution—an unavailing one, as it proved—for the safety of both parties and the peace—

[¹ Part of this legend says that Bruce had his horse's shoes put on backward to deceive pursuers.]

[1306 A.D.]

ful character of the meeting. They met by themselves, the slender retinue of each baron remaining apart and without the church. Between two such haughty rivals a quarrel was sure to arise, whether out of old feud or recent injury. The Scots historians say that at their private interview Bruce upbraided Comyn with his treacherous communication to Edward: the English, more improbably, state that he then, for the first time, imparted to Comyn his plan of insurrection against England, which Comyn rejected with scorn, and that this gave occasion to what followed.

Without pretending to detail what no one save the survivor could have truly described, it is certain that a violent altercation took place, in which Comyn gave Bruce the lie, and Bruce in reply stabbed Comyn with his dagger. Confounded at the rashness of his own action, in a place so sacred, Bruce hastened out of the sanctuary. There stood without two of his friends and adherents, Kirkpatrick of Closeburne, and Lindsay, a younger son of Lindsay of Crawford. They saw Bruce's bloody weapon and disordered demeanour, and inquired eagerly the cause. "I doubt," said Bruce, "I have slain the Red Comyn." "Do you trust that to doubt?" said Kirkpatrick; "I'll mak sikar" (i.e., "I'll make sure"); so saying, he rushed into the church, and despatched the wounded man. Sir Robert Comyn, the uncle of John, interfered to save his kinsman, but was slain along with him. The English justiciaries, hearing this tumult, barricaded themselves in the hall where they administered justice. Bruce, however, compelled them to surrender, by putting fire to their place of retreat, and thereafter dismissed them in safety.

This rash act of anger and impatience broke off all chance which might still have remained to Bruce of accommodating matters with Edward, who now knew his schemes of insurrection, and must have regarded Comyn as a victim of his fidelity to the English government. On the other hand, the circumstances attending the slaughter were marked with sacrilege and breach of a solemn sanctuary, so as to render the act of homicide detestable in the eyes of all save those who from a strong feeling of common interest might be inclined to make common cause with the perpetrator. This interest could only exist among the Scottish patriots, who might see in Bruce the vindicator of his country's liberty, and his own right to the crown; claims so sacred as to justify in their eyes his enforcing them against the treacherous confidant who had betrayed the secret to the foreign usurper, even with the dagger's point, and at the foot of the altar. Bruce was, therefore, in a position as critical as if he had stood midway up a dizzy precipice, where the path was cut away behind him. The crown of Scotland hung within a possibility of his reaching it; and though the effort was necessarily attended with a great risk of failure, yet an attempt to retreat in any other direction must have been followed by inevitable destruction. Sensible of the perils of the choice, Bruce, therefore, resolved to claim the throne, with the unalterable resolution either to free his country or perish in the attempt.

He retired from Dumfries into the adjoining wilds of Nithsdale, and resided in obscurity in the hut of a poor man, near the remarkable hill called the Dun of Tynron. Meantime he sent messengers abroad in every direction, to collect his friends and followers through his extensive estates, and to warn such nobles as he knew to be favourable to Scottish independence. But their numbers were but few, and they were ill prepared for a hasty summons. His own family supplied him with four bold brethren, all men of hardihood and skill in arms. His nephew, afterwards the celebrated Thomas Randolph, and his brother-in-law, Christopher Seaton, also followed the cause

[1306 A.D.]

of their relation. Of churchmen, the primate of Scotland, the bishop of Glasgow, and the abbot of Scone joined in the undertaking, together with the earls of Lennox and of Athol, and some fourteen barons, with whose assistance Bruce was daring enough to defy the whole strength of England. He went from Dumfriesshire to Glasgow, where he determined to take the decisive measure of celebrating his coronation at Scone. On his road thither Bruce was joined by a warrior, who continued till his death the best and most disinterested of his friends and adherents. This was the young Sir James of Douglas [called "the Good"], son of William of Douglas, the heroic companion of Wallace, and, like his father, devoted to the independence of Scotland.

BRUCE IS CROWNED AT SCONE, AND PUT TO FLIGHT (1306 A.D.)

On the 27th of March, 1306, the ceremony of crowning Bruce was performed at Scone with as much state as the means of the united barons would permit. Edward had carried off the royal crown of Scotland: a slight coronet of gold was hastily made to supply its place. The earls of Fife had, since the days of Malcolm Canmore, uniformly possessed and exercised the right of placing the crown on the king's head at his coronation, in memory of the high services rendered by their ancestor, Macduff, to that monarch. On this occasion the earl of Fife did not attend; but the right was, contrary to his inclination, exercised by his sister, Isabella, the countess of Buchan, who absconded from her husband, in order that the blood of Macduff might render the service due to the heir of Malcolm Canmore. For this she was afterwards strangely and cruelly punished by Edward I.

Although the figure which Robert Bruce had hitherto made in public life was of a fickle and apparently selfish description, yet his character for chivalrous accomplishments stood high, and when he took the field many of Wallace's old followers began to join him. Meantime Edward directed Aymer de Valence, earl of Pembroke, under the title of Guardian of Scotland, to proceed to put down the rebellion in that kingdom. He was accompanied by Lord Clifford and Henry Percy. The king himself was then ill, and scarce able to mount on horseback.

Meanwhile Bruce, against whom these vindictive preparations were directed, was engaged in strengthening his party, without any considerable success. His enterprise was regarded as desperate, even by his own wife (according to the English authorities), who, while he boasted to her of the sovereign rank he had obtained, said to him: "You are, indeed, a summer king: but you will scarce be a winter one." He appears to have sought an encounter with the earl of Pembroke, who, with an army of English, had thrown himself into the fortified town of Perth. Bruce arrived before the town, June 19th, 1306, with a host inferior to that of the English earl by fifteen hundred men-at-arms.

Nevertheless he sent Pembroke a challenge to come forth and fight. The Englishman replied that he would meet him on the morrow. Bruce retired to the neighbouring wood of Methven, where he took up his quarters for the night, expecting no battle until next day. But Pembroke's purpose was different from what he expressed. He caused his men instantly to take arms, though the day was far spent, and, sallying from the town of Perth, assaulted with fury the Scots, who were in their cantonments and taken at unawares. They fought boldly, and Bruce himself was thrice unhorsed.

[1306 A.D.]

At one moment he was prisoner in the hands of Sir Philip de Mowbray, who shouted aloud that he had taken the new king. Christopher Seaton struck Mowbray to the earth, and rescued his brother-in-law. About four hundred of the Scots kept together, and effected their escape to the wilds of Athol. Several prisoners were made, and some pardoned or admitted to ransom; but those of distinction were pitilessly hanged, drawn, and quartered. Young Randolph, Bruce's nephew, submitted to the king of England, and was admitted to favour.

Bruce, seeing his party almost totally dissipated by the defeat at Methven, was obliged to support himself and the few who remained with him, amongst whom were his own wife and many other ladies, by the toils of the chase. From Athol the noble fugitives retreated into Aberdeenshire, and from thence they approached the borders of Argyllshire. Winter was approaching, and threatened not only to diminish their supplies of sustenance, but was likely, by the rigour of the weather, to render it impossible for their females any longer to accompany them.

The most part of the shire of Argyll, which they now approached, was under the command of a powerful chief called Macdougall, or John of Lorn. This prince had married an aunt of the slaughtered John Comyn, and desired nothing with more ardour than an opportunity to avenge the death of his ally upon the homicide. Accordingly, when Bruce attempted to penetrate into Argyllshire at the head of his company, he was opposed by John of Lorn, who encountered him at a place called Dalry (i.e., the king's field), near the head of Strathfillan, August 11th. The Highlandmen being on foot, and armed with long pole-axes, called Lochaber-axes, attacked the little band of Bruce where the knights had no room to manage their horses, and did them much injury. Bruce, compelled to turn back, placed himself in the rear of his followers, and protected their retreat with the utmost gallantry. Three Highlanders, a father and two sons, assaulted him at once; but Bruce, completely armed, and excellent at the use of his weapon, rid himself of them by despatching them one after another.

Driven back from the road by which he had purposed to approach the western isles, where he had some hopes of finding shelter, Bruce laboured under great and increasing difficulties, the first effect of which was to compel him to separate the ladies from his company. His younger brother, Nigel Bruce, was sent to conduct the queen and her attendants back to Aberdeenshire, where his brother was still master of a strong castle, called Kildrummie, which might serve them for some time as a place of refuge.

On the banks of Loch Lomond Bruce met with the earl of Lennox, who, wandering there for protection, discovered the king was in his neighbourhood, by hearing a bugle sounded with an art which he knew to be peculiar to his master. They met, embraced, and wept. By the guidance and assistance of Lennox, Bruce reached the province of Cantire, then subject to Angus, called Lord of the Isles. Here the king met with Sir Neil Campbell, who had gone before him to propitiate this powerful Highland prince, whose favour was the more easily obtained that he was unfriendly to John Macdougall of Lorn, the personal enemy of Robert Bruce. This Angus was also the descendant of the renowned Somerled, and head of the sept of the Macdonalds, the most powerful scion of those original Scots who colonised Argyllshire under Fergus, the son of Eric, and who, seated in Cantire, Islay, and the other western islands, had, since the death of Alexander III, nearly shaken off subordination to the crown of Scotland, and paid as little respect to the English claim upon their supremacy.

[1306 A. D.]

Bruce resolved to bury himself in the remote island of Rathlin,¹ on the coast of Ireland, a rude and half-desolate islet, but inhabited by the clan of Macdonalds, and subject to their friendly lord. By this retreat he effected his purpose of secluding himself from the jealous researches made after him by the adherents of the English monarch, and the feudal hatred of John of Lorn. Here Bruce continued to lurk in concealment during the winter of 1306.

In the mean time his friends and adherents in Scotland suffered all the miseries which the rage of an exasperated and victorious sovereign could inflict. His wife and his daughter were taken forcibly from the sanctuary of Saint Duthac, at Tain, and consigned to the severities of separate English prisons, where they remained for eight years. The countess of Buchan, who had placed the crown on the Bruce's head, was immured in a place of confinement [called "a cage" and by tradition said to have been shaped like a crown], constructed expressly for her reception on the towers of the castle of Berwick, where the sight of her prison might make her the subject of wonder or scorn to all that passed. The bishop of Saint Andrews, the bishop of Glasgow, and the abbot of Scone, taken in arms, were imprisoned by Edward, who applied to the pope for their degradation, in which, however, he did not succeed. Nigel Bruce, a gallant and beautiful as well as highly accomplished youth, held out his brother's castle of Kildrummie till a traitor in the garrison set fire to the principal magazine, when surrender became inevitable. He was tried, condemned, and executed. Christopher Seaton, who so gallantly rescued the Bruce at the battle of Methven, shared with his brother-in-law the same melancholy fate. The vengeance of Edward did not spare his own blood. The earl of Athol had some relationship with the royal family of England; but the circumstance having been pleaded in favour of the earl, Edward only gave so much weight to it as to assign him the distinction of a gallows fifty feet high.

Simon Fraser, one of the commanders at the victory of Roslin (the other being the unfortunate John Comyn), still disdained to surrender, and continued in arms, till being defeated at a place called Kirkincliffe, near Stirling, he was finally made prisoner, exposed to the people of London loaded with fetters, crowned with a garland in mockery, and executed with all the studied cruelty of the treason law. To add to the disastrous deaths of his friends and associates, the fate of Bruce personally seemed utterly destitute. He was forfeited by the English government as a man guilty of murder and sacrilege, and his large estates, extending from Galloway to the Solway Firth, were bestowed on different English nobles, of which Sir Henry Percy and Lord Robert Clifford had the greatest share. A formal sentence of excommunication was at the same time pronounced against him by the papal legate, with all the terrific pomp with which Rome knows how to volley her thunders.

Thus closed the year 1306 upon Scotland. The king, lurking in an obscure isle beyond the verge of his dominions, an outlawed man, deprived at once of all civil and religious rights, and expelled from the privileges of a Christian, in as far as Rome had power to effect it; the heads and limbs of his best and bravest adherents, men like Seaton and Fraser, who had upheld the cause of their country through every species of peril, blackening in the sun on the walls of their own native cities, or garnishing those of their vindictive enemy.

[¹ Some have thought that, as Rathlin was under Edward's control, Bruce must rather have gone to Norway.]

BRUCE RETURNS TO THE CONTEST (1307 A.D.)

With the return of spring, hope and the spirit of enterprise again inspired the dauntless heart of Robert Bruce. He made a descent on the isle of Arran, with the view of passing from thence to the Scottish mainland. A faithful vassal in his earldom of Carrick engaged to watch when a landing could be made with some probability of success, and intimate the opportunity to Bruce. The signal agreed upon was a fire to be lighted by the vassal on the cape or headland beneath Turnberry Castle, upon seeing which it was resolved Bruce should embark with his men. The light long watched for at length appeared; but it had not been kindled by Bruce's confidant. The king sailed to the mainland without hesitation, and was astonished to find his emissary watching on the beach, to tell him the fire was accidental, the English were reinforced, the people dispirited, and there was nothing to be attempted with a prospect of success. Robert Bruce hesitated; but his brother Edward, a man of courage which reached to temerity, protested that he would not go again to sea, but being thus arrived in his native country, would take the good or evil destiny which Heaven might send him. Robert himself was easily persuaded to adopt the same bold counsel; and a sudden attack upon a part of the English who were quartered in the town gave them victory and a rich booty, as Percy, who lay in the castle, did not venture to sally to the relief of his men.

This advantage was followed by others. It seemed as if Fortune had exhausted her spite on the dauntless adventurer, or that Heaven regarded him as having paid an ample penance for the slaughter of Comyn. Bruce was joined by friends and followers, and the English were compelled to keep their garrisons; until Sir Henry Percy, instead of making head against the invader, deemed it necessary to evacuate Turnberry Castle, and retreat to England. James Douglas penetrated into his own country in disguise, and collecting some of his ancient followers, surprised the English garrison placed by Lord Clifford in Douglas Castle, and putting the garrison to the sword, mingled the mangled bodies with a large stock of provisions which the English had amassed, and set fire to the castle. The country people to this day call this exploit the "Douglas's Larder."

The efforts of Bruce were not uniformly successful. Two of his brothers, Thomas and Alexander, had landed in Galloway, but were defeated and made prisoners by Roland Macdougall, a chief of that country who was devoted to England. He sent the unfortunate brothers to Edward, who executed them both, and became thus accountable to Bruce for the death of three of his brethren.¹ This accident rendered the king's condition more precarious than it had been, and encouraged the Gallowegians to make many attempts against his person, in some of which they made use of bloodhounds. At one time he escaped so narrowly that his banner was taken, and, as it happened, by his own nephew, Thomas Randolph, then employed in the ranks of the English. When pressed upon on this and similar occasions, it was the custom of Bruce to elude the efforts of the enemy by dispersing his followers, who, each shifting for himself, knew where to meet again at some place of rendezvous, and often surprised and put to the sword some part of the enemy which were lying in full assurance of safety.

[¹ If for no worthier things there was room still in Edward's frail body for hatred and ferocity. He had the satisfaction yet, before he died, to reap a small but rich harvest of vengeance. These are the acts that break the spirit of servile races, but only move those of higher mettle to vengeance.—BURTON.^e]

[1307 A.D.]

At length, after repeated actions and a long series of marching and counter-marching, Pembroke was forced to abandon Ayrshire to the Bruce, as Percy had done before him. Douglas on his part was successful in Lanarkshire, and the numerous patriots resumed the courage which they had possessed under Wallace. A battle was fought at Loudoun-hill, in consequence of an express appointment, between Bruce and his old enemy the earl of Pembroke, who was returning to the west with considerable reinforcements, the 10th of May, 1307, in which the Scottish king completely avenged the defeat at Methven. Pembroke fled to Ayr, in which place of refuge the earl of Gloucester was also forced to seek safety. By these and similar skirmishes, in which his perfect knowledge of the principles of partisan warfare enabled him to take every advantage afforded by the excellence of his intelligence arising from the good will of the country, or by circumstances of ground, weather, weapons, and the like, the Scottish king gradually accustomed his men to repose so much confidence in his skill and wisdom that his orders for battle were regarded as a call to assured victory. He himself, James Douglas, and others among his followers, displayed at the same time all that personal and chivalrous valour which the manners of the age demanded of a leader, and which often restored a battle when well-nigh lost. It was to these latter qualities also, as well as to precaution and sagacity, that Bruce was indebted for his escape from several treacherous attempts to take away his life, by the friends of the slaughtered Comyn, or the adherents of the king of England. Several of such assassins were slain by Robert with his own hand; and a general opinion, long suppressed by the former course of adverse events, began to be entertained through Scotland that Heaven, in the hour of utmost need, had raised up in the heir of the Scottish throne a prince destined by Providence to deliver his country, and that no weapon forged against him should prosper.



OLD ENTRANCE GATE AT ARRAN

THE DEATH OF EDWARD I AND ACCESSION OF EDWARD II (1307 A.D.)

In fulfilment of his romantic vow, "to heaven and the swans," Edward had advanced as far as Carlisle, to open his proposed campaign against the Scots, but had been detained there during the whole winter by the wasting effects of a dysentery. As the season of action approached, and the rumours of Bruce's success increased, the king persuaded himself that resentment would restore him the strength which age and disease had impaired.

It was, indeed, a mortifying condition in which he found himself. For the space of nineteen or twenty years the conquest of Scotland had been the darling object of his thoughts and plans. It had cost him the utmost exertion of his bold and crafty faculties—blood had been shed without measure, wealth lavished without grudging, to accomplish this darling plan; and now, when disease had abated his strength and energies, he was doomed to see

[1307-1308 A.D.]

from his sick-bed the hills of Scotland, while he knew that they were still free.

As if endeavouring to restore by a strong effort of the mind the failing strength of his body, he declared himself recovered, hung up in the cathedral the horse-litter in which he had hitherto travelled, but which he conceived he should need no longer, and, mounting his war-horse, proceeded northward. It was too forced an effort to be continued long. Edward only reached the village of Burgh on the Sands, and expired there on the 7th of July, 1307. On his death-bed his thoughts were entirely on the Scottish affairs: he made his son swear that he would prosecute the war without truce or breathing-space; he repeated the strange injunction that, his flesh being boiled from his bones, the latter should be transported at the head of the army with which he was about to invade Scotland, and never be restored to the tomb till that obstinate nation was entirely subdued. By way of corollary to this singular precept the dying king bequeathed his heart to be sent to the Holy Land, in whose defence he had once fought.⁴

For his epitaph he ordered these words put on his tomb, "Edwardus Primus, Scotorum Malleus" ("Edward I, Hammer of the Scots"). Against the praises of his glorious achievements, Buckle⁵ and others have emphasised the fact that all the treasures he spent, the lives of English and Scotch he sacrificed, were in vain, for his conquest fell to naught the moment his strong hand was helpless to check the growing power of Bruce.⁶

Edward II, the feeble yet headstrong successor of the most sagacious and resolute of English princes, neglected the extraordinary direction of the dying monarch respecting the disposal of his body, which he caused to be interred at Westminster (by which means the bones of Edward I probably escaped falling into Scottish custody), and naming first the earl of Pembroke, and afterwards John de Bretagne, earl of Richmond, in his room, to be Guardian of Scotland, he himself found it more agreeable to hasten back to share the pleasures of London with Gaveston and his other minions, than to undertake the difficult and laborious task of subduing Bruce and his hardy associates.

The English Guardian, however, did his duty, and soon assembled a force so superior to that of Bruce that the king thought it necessary to shift the war into the northern parts of Scotland, where the enemy could not be so suddenly reinforced. He left the indefatigable James of Douglas to carry on the war in the wooded and mountainous district of Ettrick forest.

In Aberdeenshire King Robert was joined by Sir Alexander and Sir Simon Fraser, sons of the gallant hero of Roslin. But he was opposed by Comyn, earl of Buchan, who to party hatred added an eager desire to revenge the death of his kinsman slain by Bruce. The time seemed favourable for his purpose, for Bruce was at this time afflicted with a lingering and wasting distemper, which impaired his health and threatened his life. In this condition, he thought it wise to retreat before the earl of Buchan, who at length pressed so closely on his rear as to beat up their quarters in the town of Old Meldrum, and cause some loss. "These folks will work a cure on me," said Bruce, starting from the litter which he had been of late compelled to use; and rushing into battle, though obliged to be supported in his saddle, he was so actively seconded by his troops that he totally defeated the earl of Buchan; and in reward for the pertinacity with which that lord had pursued him, he ravaged his country so severely that the "herrying" of Buchan was the subject of lamentation for a hundred years afterwards, and traces of the devastation may be even yet seen.

[1308 A.D.]

The citizens of Aberdeen declared in Bruce's favour, and adding acts to professions, stormed and took the castle, and expelled the English garrison. The citadel of Forfar was also taken, and both fortresses were demolished by order of Bruce; a course of policy which he always observed, because the English were more skilful in the attack and defence of fortified places.

Edward Bruce fought and won several actions against the English in Galloway, as well as against the natives of that barbarous country, who had always taken part against the Bruce's interest. He gained these successes through exertion of a reckless courage which defied all the usual calculations of prudence. At length, after a severe defeat given to the native chiefs and their southern allies on the banks of the Dee, June 29th, 1308, Edward expelled the English entirely from Galloway, and brought that rude province into submission to his brother.

Douglas again retook and dismantled his own fortress of Douglas, upon which he had now made three attacks, two of which were completely successful. He then proceeded to scour the hills of Tweeddale and the forest of Ettrick. In reconnoitring the country on the small river of Lyne the Douglas approached a house, in which a spy whom he sent forward heard men talking loudly, one of whom used the "devil's name" as an oath or adjuration. Conjecturing they must be soldiers who dared make familiar use of so formidable a phrase, Douglas caused his attendants to beset the house, and made prisoners therein Thomas Randolph, the king's nephew, and Alexander Stewart of Bonkill, both of whom since the battle of Methven had adhered to the English interest. They were well treated and sent to the king, who gently rebuked Randolph for breach of allegiance. "It is you," said the haughty young warrior, "who degrade your own cause by trusting to ambushades instead of facing the English in the field." "That may happen in due time," replied Bruce: "in the mean time it is fitting that you be taught your duty by restraint." Thomas Randolph was sent accordingly to prison, where he did not long remain. He was reconciled to his uncle, whom he ever after served with the utmost fidelity: indeed, Douglas only, among the followers of the Bruce, was held to equal him in military fame. [He later became the "great earl of Moray."]

THE RAPID TRIUMPH OF BRUCE

Bruce's successes now enabled him to chastise the lord of Lorn, by whom, after his defeat at Methven, he had been so severely persecuted. He marched towards Argyllshire, and arrived at Dalmally. Here he learned that John of Lorn and his Highlanders had stationed themselves in a formidable pass, where the great mountain of Cruachan-Ben sinks down upon the margin of Loch-Awe, so that the road passes among precipices on the left hand, and the deep lake on the other. But Bruce understood as well as any modern tactician how such difficulties were to be overcome. While he himself engaged the attention of the mountaineers by threatening an assault in front, he despatched Douglas, with a party of light troops, to march round the mountain and turn the pass, thus attacking the defenders in front, flank, and rear at once. They were routed with great slaughter. The lords of Lorn, father and son, escaped by sea. Their castle of Dunstaffnage was taken, and their country pillaged, August, 1308.

Thus did Robert Bruce, with steady and patient resolution, win province after province from the English, encouraging and rewarding his friends, overawing and chastising his enemies, and rendering his authority more

[1809-1811 A.D.]

respected day by day. The profound wisdom and resolute purpose of Edward I would have been required to sustain, against Bruce's talents, the conquests he had made; but the weak and fickle character of his son was all that England had to oppose to him.'

The measures to which Edward resorted were imperfect, feeble, hastily assumed, and laid aside without apparent reason. At one time he put his faith in William de Lambyrton, the archbishop of Saint Andrews, whom his father had cast into prison. This prelate being liberated and pensioned by the second Edward, volunteered his services to promulgate the bull of excommunication against Robert Bruce; but if the bull had made but slight impression on the Scots during the king's adversity, it met with still less regard when the splendour of repeated success disposed his countrymen in general to blot from their remembrance the deed of violence with which so brilliant a career had commenced. The death of John Comyn was but like a morning cloud which is forgotten in the blaze of a summer noon.

THE TRUCE OF 1309 AND THE DECLARATION OF THE CLERGY

The king of France, who had deserted the Scots in their utmost need, now began to be once more an intercessor in their behalf; and the English king consented to offer a truce to Bruce and his adherents; but the Scots, on their part, required payment of a sum of money before they would grant one. Edward's measures showed a predominance of weakness and uncertainty.

All public measures in Scotland, on the other hand, were marked by the steadiness of conscious superiority which they borrowed from the character of their sovereign. The estates of the kingdom solemnly declared the award of Edward adjudging the crown of Scotland to John Baliol was an injustice to the grandfather of Bruce. They recognised the deceased lord of Annandale as the true heir of the crown, owned his grandson as their king, and denounced the doom of treason against all who should dispute his right to the crown.* The clergy of the kingdom [assembled at Dundee in February, 1309] issued a spiritual charge to their various flocks, acknowledging Bruce as their sovereign, in spite of the thunders of excommunication which had been launched against him.

At length, in 1310, Edward, roused into action, assembled a large army at Berwick, and entered Scotland, but too late in the year for any effective purpose. Bruce was contented with eluding the efforts of the invaders to bring on a general battle, cutting off their provisions, harassing their marches, and augmenting the distress and danger of an invading army in a country at once hostile and desolate. A second, a third, a fourth expedition was attempted with equally indifferent success. What mischief the Scots might sustain by these irruptions was fearfully compensated by the retaliation of King Robert, who ravaged the English frontiers with pitiless severity.

King Robert left the borders to present himself before Perth, which was well fortified, and held out by an English garrison. In one place the moat was so shallow that it might be waded. On that point Bruce made a daring attack. Having previously thrown the garrison off their guard by a pretended retreat, he appeared suddenly before the town at the head of a chosen storming

[* Robert Bruce is reported to have said that he would have esteemed it of more honour to win a foot of soil from Edward I than to wrest a whole kingdom from Edward II.]

[* This action of the estates is mentioned by Kerr,^k but according to Tytler,^g "no record of such proceeding remains."]

[1311-1313 A.D.]

party. He himself led the way, completely armed, bearing a scaling ladder in his hand, waded through the moat where the water reached to his chin, and was the second man who mounted the wall. The place was speedily taken.

The confidential friends to whom Bruce intrusted the command of separate detachments in various parts of Scotland, among whom were men of high military talent, endeavoured to outdo each other in following the example of their heroic sovereign. Douglas and Randolph particularly distinguished themselves in this patriotic rivalry. The strong and large castle of Roxburgh was secured by its position, its fortifications, and the number of the garrison from any siege which the Scots could have formed. But on the eve of Shrove Tuesday (March 6th, 1313), when the garrison were full of jollity and indulging in drunken wassail, Douglas and his followers approached the castle, creeping on hands and feet, and having dark cloaks flung over their armour. They seemed to the English soldiers a strayed herd of some neighbouring peasant's cattle, which had been suffered to escape during the festivity of the evening. They therefore saw these objects arrive on the verge of the moat and descend into it without wonder or alarm, nor did they discover their error till the shout of "Douglas! Douglas!" announced that the wall was scaled and the castle taken. As if to match this gallant action, Thomas Randolph possessed himself of the yet stronger castle of Edinburgh, March 14th, 1313. This also was by surprise.

The Bruce's success was not limited to the mainland of Scotland; he pursued the Macdougall of Galloway, to whom he owed the captivity and subsequent death of his two brothers, into the Isle of Man, where he defeated him totally, stormed his castle of Rushin, and subjected his island to the Scottish domination. When Bruce returned to the mainland of north Britain from this expedition, he had the pleasure to find that the energy of his brother Edward had pursued the great work of expelling the English invaders with uninterrupted success. He had taken the town and castle of Rutherglen and of Dundee; the last of which had during the previous year resisted the Scottish arms, in consequence, partly, of a breach of compact.

But this good news was chequered by news of a more doubtful quality. After his success at Rutherglen and Dundee, Sir Edward Bruce laid siege to Stirling, the only considerable fortress in Scotland which still remained in the hands of the English. The governor, Sir Philip de Mowbray, defended himself with great valour, but at length, becoming straitened for provisions, entered into a treaty, by which he agreed to surrender the fortress if not relieved before the feast of Saint John the Baptist, in the ensuing midsummer. Bruce was greatly displeased with the precipitation of his brother Edward in entering into such a capitulation without waiting his consent. It engaged him necessarily in the same risk which had so often proved fatal to the Scots, namely, that of perilling the fate of the kingdom upon a general battle, in which the numbers, discipline, and superior appointments of the English must insure them an advantage, which experience had shown they were far from possessing over their northern neighbours when they encountered in small bodies. The king upbraided his brother with the temerity of his conduct; but Edward, with the reckless courage which characterised him, defended his agreement on the usage of chivalry, and rather seemed to triumph in having brought the protracted conflict between the kingdoms to the issue of a fair field.

Meantime Sir Philip de Mowbray, governor of Stirling, availed himself of the truce which the treaty had procured for the garrison under his com-

[1313-1314 A.D.]

mand to hasten in person to London, and state to Edward and his council that almost the last remnant of Edward the first's conquests in Scotland must be irretrievably lost unless Stirling was relieved. The time allowed by the treaty including several months, was sufficient for collecting the whole gigantic force of England, and the disposition both of the king and his nobility was earnest in employing it to the best advantage.

The preparations of England for this decisive enterprise were upon such a scale as to stagger the belief of modern historians, yet their extent is proved by the records which are still extant. Ninety-three great tenants of the crown brought forth their entire feudal service of cavalry, to the number of forty thousand, three thousand of whom were completely sheathed in steel, both horses and riders. The levies in the counties of England and Wales extended to twenty-seven thousand infantry. A great force was drawn from Ireland, both under English barons, settlers in that country, and under twenty-six Irish chiefs, who were ordered to collect their vassals and join the army. The whole array was summoned to meet at Berwick on June 11th, 1314, the period being prolonged to the last limits Sir Philip Mowbray's engagement would permit, in order to give time to collect the vast quantity of provisions, forage, and everything else required for the movement and support of a host, which was indisputably the most numerous that an English monarch ever led against Scotland, amounting in all to upwards of one hundred thousand men.¹

Bruce, who was well informed respecting these formidable preparations, exhausted the resources of his powerful military genius in devising and preparing the means of opposing them.

DEFICIENCIES OF THE SCOTCH ARMY

The crisis of this long and inveterate war seemed approaching. From the spring of 1306 to that of 1314 the fortunes of Bruce seem to have been so much on the ascendant that none of the slight reverses with which his career was chequered could be considered as seriously interrupting it. He was now acknowledged as king through the greater part of Scotland, although far from possessing the decisive authority attached to the chief magistrate of a settled government. Bruce had chiefly to provide against three disadvantages, being the same which oppressed Wallace at the battle of Falkirk, and of which the first two at least continued to be severely felt by the Scottish in every general action with the English while they remained separate nations.

The first was the Scottish king's great deficiency in cavalry, which, more especially the men-at-arms, who were arrayed in complete steel, was accounted by far the most formidable part, or rather the only efficient part of a feudal army. On this point Bruce held an opinion more proper to our age than to his. He had, perhaps, seen the battle of Falkirk, where the resistance of the Scottish masses of infantry had been so formidable as well-nigh to foil the English cavalry, and he knew the particulars of that of Coutray, where the French men-at-arms were defeated by the Flemish pikemen. His own experience of the battle of Loudoun-hill went to support the opinion, though accounted singular at the time, that a body of steady infantry, armed with spears and other long weapons, and judiciously posted, would, if they

[¹ "This number has never been seriously disputed. There can be no doubt that the army thus assembled for the 'final conquest of Scotland' was the most numerous and best equipped that ever before or since stood on British ground."—BURNS.²]

[1314 A.D.]

could be brought to stand firm and keep their ranks, certainly beat off a superior body of horse—a maxim uncontroverted in modern warfare.

Bruce's second difficulty lay in the inferiority of his archers, whose formidable shafts constituted the artillery of the day. The bow was never a favourite weapon with the Scottish, and their archery were generally drawn from the Highlands, undisciplined, and rudely armed with a short bow, very loosely strung: this, being drawn to the breast in using it, discharged a clumsy arrow with a heavy head of forked iron, which was shot feebly, and with little effect.¹ These ill-trained and ill-armed archers were all whom the Scottish had to oppose to the celebrated yeomen of England, who could manage a bow of six feet long, and by drawing the arrow to his ear, gain purchase enough to discharge shafts of a cloth-yard long.

The third disadvantage at which this decisive contest must be fought on the part of Scotland was the disparity of numbers, which was very great. Robert's utmost exertions on this trying occasion could not collect together more than about thirty thousand fighting men, though, as was usual with a Scottish army, there were followers of the camp amounting to ten thousand more, to whom, although usually a useless incumbrance, or rather a nuisance to a well-ordered army, fortune assigned on this occasion a singular influence on the fortune of the day. Bruce, thus inferior in numbers, endeavoured, like an able general, to compensate the disadvantage by so choosing his ground as to compel the enemy to narrow their front of attack, and prevent them from availing themselves of their numerous forces, by extending them in order to turn his flanks.

With such resolutions, Robert Bruce summoned the array of his kingdom to rendezvous in the Tor-wood, near the brook of Bannockburn,² about four miles from Stirling, and by degrees prepared the field of battle which he had selected for the contest.

INCIDENTS AND EFFECTS OF BANNOCKBURN

Having led his troops into the field of combat, on the tidings of the English approach, June 23rd, 1314, the king of Scotland commanded his soldiers to arm themselves, and making proclamation that those who were not prepared to conquer or die with their sovereign were at liberty to depart, he was answered by a cheerful and general expression of their determination to take their fate with him. The followers of the camp were dismissed with the baggage, to station themselves behind an eminence to the rear of the Scottish army, still called the Gillies' (that is, the servants') hill.

On approaching Stirling, the English king detached Sir Robert Clifford with eight hundred horse, directing him to avoid the front of the Scottish army, and, fetching a circuit round them, turn their left flank, and throw himself into Stirling. The English knight made a circuit eastwards, where some low ground concealed his manœuvres, when the eagle eye of Bruce detected a line of dust, with glancing of spears and flashing of armour, taking northward, in the direction of Stirling. He pointed this out to Randolph. "They have passed where you kept ward," said he. "Ah, Randolph, there is a rose fallen from your chaplet!"

[¹ A picturesque account of how the Scottish army of this time looked and moved will be found, as quoted from Froissart, in our history of England, Vol. xviii.]

[² The battle of Bannockburn has been so fully described in our history of England, Vol. xviii., ch. xi., that we include here only a few personal incidents illuminative of the character of the Scotch warriors.]

[1314 A.D.]

The earl of Moray was wounded by the reproach, and with such force as he had around him, which amounted to a few scores of spearmen on foot, he advanced against Clifford to redeem his error. The English knight, interrupted in his purpose of gaining Stirling, wheeled his large body of cavalry upon Randolph, and charged him at full speed. The earl of Moray threw his men into a circle to receive the charge, the front kneeling on the ground, the second stooping, the third standing upright, and all of them presenting their spears like a wall against the headlong force of the advancing cavaliers. The combat appeared so unequal to those who viewed it from a distance that they considered Randolph as lost, and Douglas requested the king's assistance to fetch him off. "It may not be," said the Bruce; "Randolph must pay the penalty of his indiscretion. I will not disorder my line of battle for him."—"Ah, noble king," said Douglas, "my heart cannot suffer me to see Randolph perish for lack of aid"; and with a permission half extorted from the king, half assumed by himself, Douglas marched to his defence; but upon approaching the scene of conflict, the little body of Randolph was seen emerging like a rock in the waves, from which the English cavalry were retreating on every side with broken ranks, like a repelled tide. "Hold and halt!" said the Douglas to his followers; "we are come too late to aid them; let us not lessen the victory they have won by affecting to claim a share in it." When it is remembered that Douglas and Randolph were rivals for fame, this is one of the bright touches which illuminate and adorn the history of those ages of which blood and devastation are the predominant character.

Another preliminary event took place the same evening. Bruce himself, mounted upon a small horse or pony, was attentively marshalling the ranks of his vanguard. He carried a battle-axe in his hand, and was distinguished to friend and enemy by a golden coronet which he wore on his helmet. A part of the English vanguard made its appearance at this time; and a knight amongst them, Sir Henry de Bohun, conceiving he saw an opportunity of gaining himself much honour, and ending the Scottish war at a single blow, couched his lance, spurred his powerful war-horse, and rode against the king at full career, with the expectation of bearing him to the earth by the superior strength of his charger and length of his weapon. The king, aware of his purpose, stood as if expecting the shock; but the instant before it took place he suddenly moved his little palfrey to the left, avoided the unequal encounter, and striking the English knight with his battle-axe, as he passed him in his career, he dashed helmet and head to pieces, and laid Sir Henry Bohun at his feet a dead man.⁴

Barbour¹ who is the sole authority for this incident, says that Bruce spurred forward to meet Sir Henry.

"Schyr Henry myssit the noble king,
And he that in his stirrups stood
With the ax that was hard and gud,
With so gret main reached him a dint
That neither hat nor helm might stint
The heavy dusche that he him gave,
That near the head to the harness clave."¹

The Scottish nobles remonstrated with Robert on the hazard in which he placed his person. The king looked at his weapon, and only replied, "I have broke my good battle-axe."

On the morning of Saint Barnaby, called the Bright, being June 24th,

[1314 A.D.]

1314, Edward advanced in full form to the attack of the Scots, whom he found in their position of the preceding evening.

As the Scottish saw the immense display of their enemies rolling towards them like a surging ocean, they were called on to join in an appeal to Heaven against the strength of human foes. Maurice, the abbot of Inchaffray, bare-headed and bare-footed, walked along the Scottish line, and conferred his benediction on the soldiers, who knelt to receive it, and to worship the Power in whose name it was bestowed.

During this time the king of England was questioning Umfraville about the purpose of his opponents. "Will they," said Edward, "abide battle?"—"They assuredly will," replied Umfraville; "and to engage them with advantage, your highness were best order a seeming retreat, and draw them out of their strong ground." Edward rejected this counsel, and observing the Scottish soldiers kneel down, joyfully exclaimed, "They crave mercy." "It is from Heaven, not from your highness," answered Umfraville: "on that field they will win or die." The king then commanded the charge to be sounded and the attack to take place.

The English archers, as at the battle of Falkirk, now began to show their formidable skill, at the expense of the Scottish spearmen; but for this Bruce was prepared. He commanded Sir Robert Keith, the marshal of Scotland, with those four hundred men-at-arms whom he had kept in reserve for the purpose, to make a circuit and charge the English bowmen in the flank. This was done with a celerity and precision which dispersed the whole archery, who having neither stakes or other barrier to keep off the horse, nor long weapons to repel them, were cut down at pleasure, and almost without resistance.

The battle continued to rage, but with disadvantage to the English. The Scottish archers had now an opportunity of galling their infantry without opposition; and it would appear that King Edward could find no means of bringing any part of his numerous centre or rearguard to the support of those in the front, who were engaged at disadvantage. The cause seems to have been that, his army consisting in a great measure of horse, a space of ground was wanted for the squadrons to act in divisions and with due order.

Bruce, seeing the confusion thicken, now placed himself at the head of the reserve, and addressing Angus of the Isles in the words, "My hope is constant in thee," rushed into the engagement, followed by all the troops he had hitherto kept in reserve. The effect of such an effort, reserved for a favourable moment, failed not to be decisive. Those of the English who had been staggered were now constrained to retreat; those who were already in retreat took to actual flight.

At this critical moment the camp-followers of the Scottish army, seized with curiosity to see how the day went, or perhaps desirous to have a share of the plunder, suddenly showed themselves on the ridge of the Gillies'-hill, in the rear of the Scottish line of battle; and as they displayed cloths and horse coverings upon poles for ensigns, they bore in the eyes of the English the terrors of an army with banners. The belief that they beheld the rise of an ambuscade, or the arrival of a new army of Scots, gave the last impulse of terror, and all fled now, even those who had before resisted. The slaughter was immense; the deep ravine of Bannockburn, to the south of the field of battle, lying in the direction taken by most of the fugitives, was almost choked and bridged over with the slain, the difficulty of the ground retarding the fugitive horsemen till the lancers were upon them. Others, and in great numbers, rushed into the river Forth, in the blindness of terror, and perished

[1314 A.D.]

there. No less than twenty-seven barons fell in the field: the earl of Gloucester was at the head of the fatal list. Young, brave, and high-born, when he saw the day was lost, he rode headlong on the Scottish spears and was slain. Sir Robert Clifford, renowned in the Scottish wars, was also killed. Two hundred knights and seven hundred esquires of high birth and blood graced the list of slaughter with the noblest names of England; and thousands of the common file filled up the fatal roll.¹

The king by a rapid and continued flight through a country in which his misfortunes must have changed many friends into enemies, at length gained the castle of Dunbar, where he was hospitably received by the earl of March. From Dunbar Edward escaped almost alone to Berwick in a fishing skiff, having left behind him the finest army a king of England ever commanded.

The quantity of spoil gained by the victors at the battle of Bannockburn was inestimable, and the ransoms paid by the prisoners largely added to the mass of treasure. Five near relations to the Bruce, namely, his wife, her sister Christian, his daughter Marjory, the bishop of Glasgow (Wishart), and the young earl of Mar, the king's nephew, were exchanged against the earl of Hereford, high constable of England. The Scottish loss was very small. Sir William Vipont and Sir Walter Ross were the only persons of consideration slain. Sir Edward Bruce is said to have been so much attached to the last of these knights as to have expressed his wish that the battle had remained unfought, so Ross had not died.⁴

Burns^c has said of Bruce's tactics: "It was the same that Wallace had practically taught, and it had just helped the Flemings to their victory of Courtrai. Its leading feature was, the receiving charges of cavalry by clumps, square or circular, of spearmen; and, simple as it was, it was revolutionising the military creed of Europe by sapping the universal faith in the invincibility of mounted men-at-arms by any other kind of troops."

Burns^b emphasises the fact that "Wallace actually was the author, at home at least, of this important tactic. The Scottish victory of Stirling Bridge was won by Wallace, against the Norman-English in the year 1297, and the Scottish battle of Falkirk was fought by him against the same enemy in 1298; while the Flemish victory of Courtrai, against the king of France, did not occur till the year 1302. Again, the Scottish victory of Loudon-hill, by Bruce against the Norman-English under Pembroke, occurred in the year 1307, and the victory of Bannockburn in the month of June, 1314; while the Swiss victory of Morgarten over the Austrians did not occur till the month of November, 1315."

Sir Walter Scott⁴ has thus summed up the effect of the battle:

"As a lesson of tactics, the Scots might derive from this great action principles on which they might have gained many other victories. Robert Bruce had shown them that he could rid the phalanx of Scottish spearmen of the fatal annoyance of the English archery, and that, secured against their close and continued volleys of arrows, the infantry could experience little danger from the furious charge of the men-at-arms. Yet in no battle, save that of Bannockburn, do we observe the very obvious movement of dispersing the bowmen by means of light horse ever thought of, or at least adopted; although it is obvious that the same charge which drove the English archers from the field might have enabled the bowmen of Scotland to come

[¹ Like Courtrai and Morgarten, Bannockburn marked the momentous change from mediæval to modern warfare. The armed knights gave place to the common soldiers led by skillful generals as the arbiters of the destiny of nations. In the career of Bruce it was the turning-point.—McKAY.⁷]

[1314 A.D.]

into the action, with unequal powers, perhaps, but with an effect which might have been formidable when unopposed.

"But if, in a strategical point of view, the field of Bannockburn was lost on the Scottish nation, they derived from it a lesson of pertinacity in national defence which they never afterwards forgot during the course of their remaining a separate people. They had seen, before the battle of Bannockburn, the light of national freedom reduced to the last spark, their patriots slain, their laws reversed, their monuments plundered and destroyed, their prince an excommunicated outlaw, who could not find in the wildernesses of his country a cave dark and inaccessible enough to shelter his head; all this they had seen in 1306; and so completely had ten years of resistance changed the scene, that the same prince rode over a field of victory a triumphant sovereign, the first nobles of the English enemies lying dead at his feet or surrendering themselves for ransom. It seems likely that it was from the recollection of that extraordinary change of fortune that the Scots drew the great lesson, never to despair of the freedom of their country, but to continue resistance to invaders, even when it seemed most desperate.

"Dark times succeeded these brilliant days, and none more gloomy than those during the reign of the conqueror's son. But though there might be fear or doubt, there could not be a thought of despair when Scotsmen saw hanging like hallowed reliques above their domestic hearths the swords with which their fathers served the Bruce at the field of Bannockburn. And the Scots may have the pride to recollect, and other nations to learn from their history, that to a brave people one victory will do more to sustain the honourable spirit of independence than twenty defeats can effect to suppress it."

Froude⁹ says: "Experience sufficiently stern had convinced the English government that their northern neighbours would never stoop to the supremacy inflicted upon Wales; and had shown resolutely that they would die to the last man before they would acquiesce in servitude, might be exterminated, but could not be subdued. After the battle of Bannockburn the impossible task had been tacitly relinquished, and the separate existence of Scotland, as an independent kingdom, was no longer threatened."

Burns,¹⁰ however, adds this comment: "This, if taken literally, is misleading. No doubt, the defeat was of so decisive a character as to render the final result all but certain. But it required many others, though of a minor kind, to bring about the conviction described by Mr. Froude; and it was yet fourteen long years till the Treaty of Northampton."

Finally we may quote Dr. Thomas Arnold¹¹ on the influence of Bannockburn on English history: "So little does the prosperity of a people depend upon success in war, that two of the greatest defeats we (English) ever suffered have been two of our greatest blessings—Orleans and Bannockburn. It is curious, too, that in Edward II's reign the victory over the Irish proved our curse, as our defeat by the Scots turned out a blessing. Had the Irish remained independent, they might afterwards have been united to us as Scotland was; and had Scotland been reduced to subjection, it would have been another curse to us, like Ireland."¹²

The victory of Bannockburn produced an effect on the public mind through England which, did we not find it recorded by her own historians, we could hardly reconcile to the triumphs of the same people in the past reign of Edward I, and the subsequent one of Edward III. "A hundred English," says Walsingham,¹³ "would not be ashamed to fly from three or four private Scottish soldiers, so much had they lost their national courage."

Thrice within twelve months Scottish armies, commanded by James

[1315-1316 A.D.]

Douglas and Edward Bruce, broke into the English frontiers, and ravaged them with fire and sword, executing great cruelties on the unfortunate inhabitants, forcing the few who could so escape to take shelter under the fortifications of Berwick, Newcastle, or Carlisle, all strong towns, carefully fortified and numerous garrisons. In the mean time a famine spread its ravages through both countries.

EDWARD BRUCE APPOINTED HEIR; HE INVADES IRELAND (1315 A.D.)

In 1315 the estates or parliament of Scotland, bethinking themselves of the evils sustained by the nation at the death of Alexander III, through the uncertainty of the succession to the crown, entered into an act of settlement, by which Edward, the king's brother, we may suppose upon the ancient principles of the Scottish nation, was called to the throne in case of Robert's decease without heirs male; and Edward or his issue failing, the succession was assured to King Robert's only child, Marjory, and her descendants. The princess was immediately married to Walter, the high-steward [or steward] of Scotland,¹ and the heir of that auspicious marriage having succeeded in a subsequent generation to the throne of Scotland, their descendants later sat upon that of Britain.

It is probable that Robert's acquaintance with his brother Edward's martial character and experience in war inclined him to give his assent that he and his issue should occupy the throne, rather than expose the unsettled state to the government of a female by devolving it upon his own daughter. But there is also reason to believe that the monarch was suspicious that the fiery valour and irregular ambition of Edward would lead him to dispute the right of his daughter; and King Robert was willing to spare Scotland the risk of a disputed claim to the throne, found by experience to be the inlet of so many evils, even at the sacrifice of postponing the right of his own daughter. If this be the ground of the arrangement, it is an additional instance of the paternal regard which the great Bruce bore to the nation whose monarchy he had restored, and whose independence he had asserted.

But Edward Bruce's ambition was too impatient to wait the succession to the Scottish crown. A party of Irish chiefs sent an invitation to Edward Bruce to come over with a force adequate to expel the English from Ireland, and assume the sceptre. By consent of King Robert, who was pleased to make a diversion against England upon a vulnerable point, Edward invaded Ireland at the head of a force of six thousand Scots [and three hundred small vessels, May 25th, 1315].

He fought many battles and gained them all. He became master of the province of Ulster, and was solemnly crowned king of Ireland; but found himself amid his successes obliged to entreat the assistance of King Robert with fresh supplies; for the impetuous Edward, who never spared his own person, was equally reckless of exposing his followers; and his successes were misfortunes, in so far as they wasted the brave men with whose lives they were purchased. Robert Bruce led supplies to his brother's assistance, May 2nd, 1316, with an army which enabled him to overrun Ireland, but without gaining any permanent advantage. He threatened Dublin, and penetrated as far as Limerick in the west, but was compelled, by scarcity of

[¹ The hereditary title of Stewart became a surname, and hence the royal line of Stewart or Stuart, through which Victoria became Queen of Scotland, England, and Ireland.—Wm. Burns.^A]

[1317-1318 A.D.]

provisions, to retire again into Ulster, in the spring of 1317. He shortly after returned to Scotland, leaving a part of his troops with Edward.

After his brother's departure, Edward's career of ambition was closed at the battle of Dundalk, where, October 5th, 1318, fortune at length failed a warrior who had tried her patience by so many hazards. On that fatal day he encountered, against the advice of his officers, an Anglo-Irish army far more numerous than his own. A strong champion among the English, named John Maupas, singling out the person of Edward, slew him, and received death at his hands: their bodies were found stretched upon each other in the field of battle. The victors ungenerously mutilated the body of him before whom most of them had repeatedly fled.' A general officer of the Scots, called John Thomson, led back the remnant of the Scottish force to their own country. And thus ended the Scottish invasion of Ireland, with the loss of many brave soldiers, whom their country afterwards severely missed in her hour of need.

Meanwhile some important events had taken place in Scotland while these Irish campaigns were in progress. The king, whose attention was much devoted to nautical matters, had threatened the English coast with a disembarkation at several points. He had also destroyed what authority his ancient and mortal foe, John of Lorn, still retained in the Hebrides, made him prisoner, and consigned him to the castle of Lochleven, where he died in captivity. New efforts to disturb the English frontiers revived the evils of those unhappy countries. In 1316 Robert, at the head of a considerable army, penetrated into Yorkshire, and destroyed the country as far as Richmond, which only escaped the flames by paying a ransom. But an assault upon Berwick, and an attempt to storm Carlisle, were both successfully resisted by the English garrisons. During the time that Robert Bruce was in Ireland with his brother, the English on their side made several attempts on the borders. But though the king was absent, Douglas and Stewart defended the frontiers with the most successful valour.

BRUCE IN CONFLICT WITH THE POPE

Our history has so long conducted us through an unvarying recital of scenes of war and battle, that we feel a relief in being called to consider some intrigues of a more peaceful character, which place the sagacity of Robert Bruce in as remarkable a point of view as his bravery. The king of England, suffering by the continuation of a war which distressed him on all points, yet unwilling to purchase peace by the sacrifices which the Scots demanded, fell on the scheme of procuring a truce without loss of dignity by the intervention of the pope. John XXII, then supreme pontiff, was induced by the English influence to issue a bull, commanding a two years' peace betwixt England and Scotland. Two cardinals were intrusted with this document, with orders to pass to the nations which it concerned, and there make it known. These dignitaries of the church had also letters, both sealed and patent, addressed to both kings. And privately they were invested with powers of fulminating a sentence of excommunication against the king of Scots, his brother Edward, and any others of their adherents whom they might think fit. The cardinals, arrived in England, despatched two nuncios to Scotland, the bishop of Corbeil and a priest called Aumori, to deliver the pope's letters

[¹ Haller* says: "His body was quartered and distributed for a public spectacle over Ireland. Bermingham presented the head to the English king, and obtained the dignity of earl of Lowth as a reward for his services." Compare the treatment of Wallace.]

[1318 A.D.]

to the Scottish king. For comfort and dignity in their journey, these two reverend nuncios set out northwards, in the train of Lewis de Beaumont, bishop elect of Durham, who was passing to his diocese to receive consecration. But within a stage of Durham the party was surprised by a number of banditti, commanded by two robber knights, called Middleton and Selby, who, from being soldiers, had become chiefs of outlaws. Undeterred by the sacred character of the churchmen, they rifled them to the last farthing, and dismissing the nuncios on their journey to Scotland, carried away the bishop elect, whom they detained a captive till they extorted a ransom so large that the plate and jewels of the cathedral were necessarily sold to defray it.

Disheartened by so severe a welcome to the scene of hostilities, the nuncios at length came before Bruce, and presented the pope's letters. Those which were open he commanded to be read, and listened to the contents with much respect. But, ere opening the sealed epistles, he observed that they were addressed not to the king, but to Lord Robert Bruce, governor in Scotland.¹ "These," he said, "I will not receive nor open. I have subjects of my own name, and some of them may have a share in the government. For such the holy father's letters may be designed, but they cannot be intended for me, who am sovereign of Scotland." The nuncios had no alternative but to retire and report their answer to the cardinals. These dignitaries resolved, at all risks, to execute the pope's commission, by publishing the bulls and instruments. But not caring to trust their reverend persons across the border, they confided to Adam Newton, father guardian of the friars Minorite of Berwick, the momentous and somewhat perilous task of communicating to Robert Bruce what they had no reason to think would be agreeable tidings.

The unlucky father guardian was commanded to be gone at his own peril. The reader will anticipate the consequences. The friar on his return fell into the hands of four outlaws, who stripped him of his papers and despatches, tore, it is said, the pope's bull, doubtless to prevent that copy at least from being made use of, and sent him back to Berwick unhurt, indeed, but sorely frightened. It is diverting enough to find that the guardian surmised that, by some means or other, the documents he was intrusted with had fallen into the hands of the Lord Robert Bruce and his accomplices. It was thus that with a mixture of firmness and dexterity Bruce eluded a power which it would not have been politic to oppose directly, and baffled the attempts of the pontiff to embarrass him by spiritual opposition.

THE FIGHT FOR BERWICK (1318 A.D.)

When father Adam Newton delivered his message, or rather proffered to deliver it, to Robert Bruce, the Scottish king was lying with a body of troops in the wood of Old Cambus, where he was secretly maturing an important enterprise. Of all Edward the first's northern conquests Berwick alone remained with his unfortunate son. A burgess named Spalding, of Scottish extraction probably, if we may judge by his name, and certainly married to a Scottish woman, was so much offended at some hard usage which he had received from the English governor, that he resolved, in revenge, to betray the place to Robert Bruce. By agreement with Spalding the Scotch came beneath the walls of the town on a night when he was going the rounds, March 28th, 1318, and received his assistance in the escalade. Douglas, Randolph,

[¹ A curious repetition of this incident occurred in the early days of the American Revolution when the English admiral Howe addressed a communication to "Mr. George Washington," which he refused to receive until readdressed with his military title.]

[1218-1319 A.D.]

and a young knight, called Sir William Keith of Galston, drove back the English, after some hard fighting, into the precincts of the castle, which soon after surrendered when the king appeared in person before it. Bruce, delighted with this acquisition, placed the town and castle in charge of his brave son-in-law Walter, the high-steward of Scotland.

Having thus made sure of his important acquisition, Bruce resumed anew his destructive incursions into the northern provinces of England, burned Northallerton, Boroughbridge, and Skipton in Craven, forced Rippon to ransom itself for a thousand marks, and returned from this work of ravage, uninterrupted and unopposed, his soldiers driving their prisoners before them "like flocks of sheep." Such passages, quoted from English history, recall to the reader the invasion of the Picts and Scots upon the unwarlike South Britons. But the ascendancy asserted by the Scots over the English during this reign did not rest so much on any superiority of courage on the part of the former. The feuds among the nobility of England ran high, and the public quarrels between the king and his barons distracted the movements of the government and the military defence of the kingdom. The whole country was in that state of total discontent, division, and misrule, that it was found impossible to combine the national forces for one common object.⁴

Burton thus justifies the Scottish severity:

"All the laws of war, even those of our own time, would justify this terrible and indiscriminate retribution on the English people, for the injuries which the Scots had suffered from the English government. The longer, indeed, that the cruel persecution continued, the more ample was the justification. Just after the battle of Bannockburn it seemed needless, since the English king might be expected to abandon his claims; but all the while Scotland was soliciting peace and an acknowledgment of independence, and all the while her solicitations were thrown back with scorn. The cruel retaliation has the best of justifications—it became in the end effective. England at last spoke of a truce from hostilities."⁵

Omitting for the present some civil affairs of considerable importance, that we may trace the events of the war, we have now to mention that Edward II, stung with resentment at the loss of Berwick, determined on a desperate effort to regain that important town. Having made a temporary agreement with his discontented barons, at the head of whom was his relation Thomas, earl of Lancaster, the English king was able to assemble a powerful army with which he invested the place, July 24th, 1319.

A tremendous engine was brought forward, called "the Sow," being a large shed composed of very strong timbers, and having a roof sloping like the back of the animal from which it took its name. Like the Roman *testudo*, the sow, or movable covert, was designed to protect a body of miners beneath its shelter, while, running the end of the engine close to the wall, they employed themselves in undermining the defences of the place.

The Scots had reposed their safety in the skill of a mercenary soldier, famed for his science as an engineer. This person, by name John Crab, and a Fleming by birth, had erected a huge catapult, or machine for discharging stones, with which he proposed to destroy the English sow. The huge engine moved slowly towards the walls, September 13th, 1319; one stone, and then a second, was hurled against it in vain, and amid the shouts of both parties the massive shed was approaching the bulwark. Crab had now calculated his distance and the power of his machine, and the third stone, a huge mass of rock, fell on the middle of the sow, and broke down its formidable timbers.

[1319 A.D.]

"The English sow has farrowed!" shouted the exulting Scots, when they saw the soldiers and miners who had lain within the machine running headlong to save themselves by gaining the trenches. The Scots, by hurling lighted combustibles, of which they had a quantity prepared, consumed the materials of the English engine. The Steward, who, with a hundred men of reserve, was going from post to post distributing succours, had disposed of all his attendants except one, when he suddenly received the alarming intelligence that the English were in the act of forcing the gate called Saint Mary's. The gallant knight, worthy to be what fate designed him, the father of a race of monarchs, rushed to the spot, threw open the half-burned gate, and making a sudden sally, beat the enemy off from that as well as the other points of attack.

Bruce, although the garrison of Berwick had as yet made a successful defence, became anxious for the consequences of its being continued, and he resolved to accomplish the relief of Berwick, by making such a powerful diversion as should induce Edward to raise the siege. With this view, fifteen thousand men, under Douglas and Randolph, entered England on the west marches, and turning eastward, made a hasty march towards York, for the purpose of surprising the person of the queen of England, who then resided near that city. Isabella received notice of their purpose, and fled hastily southward. Her husband was little indebted to those who supplied her with the tidings which enabled her to make her escape.

The Chapter of Mitton: A Truce Declared

The Scots proceeded, as usual, to ravage the country. The archbishop of York, in the absence of a more professional leader, assumed arms, and assembled a large but motley army, consisting partly of country people, ecclesiastics, and others, having little skill or spirit save that which despair might inspire. The Scots encountered them with the advantage which leaders of high courage and experience possess over those who are inexperienced in war, and veteran troops over a miscellaneous and disorderly levy. The conflict took place near Mitton, on the river Swale, September 20th, 1319. By the simple stratagem of firing some stacks of hay the Scots raised a dense smoke, under cover of which a division of the army turned unperceived around the flank of the archbishop's host, and got into their rear. The irregular ranks of the English were thus attacked in front and rear at once, and instantly routed with great slaughter. Three hundred of the clerical order fell in the action, or were slain in the rout, where many of the fugitives were driven into the Swale. In the savage pleasantries of the times this battle, in which so many clergymen fell, was called "the white battle," and the "Chapter of Mitton."

The tidings of this disaster speedily obliged Edward to raise the siege of Berwick and march to the south in hope to intercept the Scots on their return from Yorkshire. Randolph and Douglas eluded the enemy by retreating to their own country through the west marches loaded with prisoners and spoil. They had plundered in this incursion eighty-four towns and villages. About the close of the same year, Douglas renewed the ravage in Cumberland and Westmoreland, and again returned with a great prey of captives and cattle, destroying at the same time the harvest which had been gathered into the farm-yards. It was said that the name of this indefatigable and successful chief had become so formidable that women used, in the northern counties, to still their froward children by threatening them with the Black Douglas.

[1318-1319 A.D.]

These sinister events led to a truce in 1319 between the two countries for the space of two years, to which Bruce, who had much to do for the internal regulation of his kingdom, willingly consented.

THE SCOTCH PARLIAMENT OF 1318

In 1318 a parliament was convoked at Scone, whose first act was an engagement for solemn allegiance to the king, and for aiding him against all mortals who should menace the liberties of Scotland or impeach his royal rights, how eminent soever might be the power, authority, and dignity of the opponent; peculiar expressions by which the pope was indicated. Whatever native of Scotland should fail in his allegiance was denounced a traitor, without remission. Edward Bruce being dead without heirs of his body, and Marjory, at that time the Bruce's only child, being also deceased, the infant prince, Robert, son of the late princess and her husband, the Steward of Scotland, and grandson of Robert, was proclaimed heir, in default of male issue of the king's body. The regency of the kingdom was settled on Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, and failing him, upon James, Lord Douglas. Rules were laid down for the succession.

An assize of arms was next enacted. Every man being liable to serve in defence of his country, all Scottish natives were required to provide themselves with weapons according to their rank and means. Every man worth ten pounds a year of land was enjoined to have in readiness a buff jacket and head-piece of steel; those whose income was less might substitute iron for the back and breast-piece, and the knapsack or helmet. All these were to have gloves of plate and a sword and spear. Each man who possessed a cow was to be equipped with a bow and sheaf of arrows, or a spear. No provisions are made for horsemen. The royal tenants-in-chief, doubtless, came forth as men-at-arms; but the policy of Robert Bruce rested the chief defence of Scotland on its excellent infantry. Prudent and humane rules were laid down for providing for the armed array, when passing to and from the king's host, directed to the end of rendering them as little burdensome as possible to the country which they traversed in arms. At the same time they were to be supplied with provisions on tender of payment. The supplying warlike weapons or armour to England was strictly prohibited, under pain of death.

The rights and independence of the Scottish church were dauntlessly asserted, in resentment, probably, of the pope's unfriendly aspect towards Bruce. Ecclesiastics were prohibited from remitting money to Rome. Native Scotsmen residing in a foreign country were not permitted to draw their revenues from Scotland. Such were the patriotic measures adopted by the parliament of Scotland held at Scone in 1318.

Pope John XXII had been highly offended with the manner in which the Bruce had neglected his injunctions for a truce and refused to receive the letters which his holiness had addressed to him. In 1318 he enjoined the two cardinals to publish the bulls of excommunication against Bruce and his adherents. The reasons alleged were, that the Scottish governor, as he affected to term him, had taken Berwick during the papal truce; that he had refused to receive the nuncios of the legates; and certain secret reasons were hinted at, which his holiness for the present kept private. Neither the church nor people of Scotland paid any attention to these bulls, though published by the legates in all solemnity. The flame of national freedom and independence burned too clear and strong to be disturbed by the breath

[1320 A.D.]

of Rome. The prelates of York and London were ordered to repeat the ceremony, with bell, book, and candle, every Sunday and festival day through the year.

THE MANIFESTO OF ABERBROTHOCK OR ARBROATH (1320 A.D.)

The parliament of Scotland now took it upon them to reply to the pope in vindication of themselves and their sovereign. At Aberbrothock or Arbroath, on April 6th, 1320, eight earls and thirty-one barons of Scotland, together with the great officers of the crown and others, in the name of the whole community of Scotland, placed their names and seals to a spirited manifesto or memorial, in which strong sense and a manly spirit of freedom are mixed with arguments suited to the ignorance of the age.

This celebrated document commences with an enumeration of proofs of the supposed antiquity of the Scottish nation, detailing its descent from Scota, daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, its conversion to the Christian faith by Saint Andrew the apostle, with the long, barbarous roll of baptised and unbaptised names, which, false and true, filled up the line of the royal family. Having astounded, as they doubtless conceived, the pontiff with the nation's claim to antiquity, of which the Scots have been at all times more than sufficiently tenacious, they proceeded in a noble tone of independence. The unjust interference of Edward I with the affairs of a free people, and the calamities which his ambition had brought upon Scotland, were forcibly described, and the subjection to which his oppression had reduced the country was painted as a second Egyptian bondage, out of which their present sovereign had conducted them victoriously by his valour and prudence, like a second Joshua or Maccabæus. The crown, they declared, was Bruce's by right of blood, by the merit which deserved it, and the free consent of the people who bestowed it. But yet they added in express terms, that not even to this beloved and honoured monarch would they continue their allegiance, should he show an inclination to subject his crown or his people to homage or dependence on England, but that they would in that case do their best to resist and expel him from the throne; "for," say the words of the letter, "while a hundred Scots are left to resist, they will fight for the liberty that is dearer to them than life." They required that the pope, making no distinction of persons, like that Heaven of which he was the viceroy, would exhort the king of England to remain content with his fair dominions, which had formerly been thought large enough to supply seven kingdoms, and cease from tormenting and oppressing a poor people his neighbours, whose only desire was to live free and unoppressed in the remote region where fate had assigned them their habitation.

They reminded the pope of his duty to preserve a general pacification throughout Christendom, that all nations might join in crusade for the recovery of Palestine, in which they and their king were eager to engage, but for the impediment of the English war. They concluded by solemnly declaring, that if his holiness should, after this explanation, favour the English in their schemes for the oppression of Scotland, at his charge must lie all the loss of mortal life and immortal happiness which might be forfeited in a war of the most exterminating character. Lastly, the Scottish prelates and barons declared their spiritual obedience to the pope, and committed the defence of their cause to the God of truth, in the firm hope that he would endow them with strength to defend their right, and confound the devices of their enemies.

[1330-1331 A.D.]

As the king of France also offered his mediation, his holiness began to make more equitable proposals for peace between England and Scotland. It is probable, however, that the sovereigns principally concerned were each of them desirous to await the issue of certain dark and mysterious intrigues, which Edward and Robert respectively knew to have existence in the court of the enemy.

A WAR OF CONSPIRACIES

And, first, for the internal discontents of Scotland. Notwithstanding the great popularity of Bruce, as is evinced by the letter of the barons which we have just analysed, there had been so many feuds, separate interests, and quarrels previous to his accession, and his destruction of the power of the Anglicised barons had given so much offence, that we cannot be surprised that there should be some throughout the nation who nourished sentiments towards their king very different from those of love and veneration, which prevailed in the community at large. These sentiments of envy and ill-will led to a conspiracy, in which David de Brechin, the king's nephew, with five other knights and three esquires, men of rank and influence, were secretly combined to a highly treasonable purpose. They had agreed, it would seem, to put the king to death, and place on the throne William de Soulis, hereditary butler of Scotland. This ambitious knight's grandfather, Nicolas de Soulis, had been a competitor for the crown as grandson of Marjory, daughter of Alexander the second, and wife of Alan Dureward; an undeniable claim, had his ancestress been legitimate. Sir William had himself been lately employed as a conservator of the truce upon the borders, and it is probable he had been then tampered with by the agents of Edward, and disposed to enter into this flagitious and it would seem hopeless conspiracy.

The countess of Strathern, to whom the guilty secret was intrusted, betrayed it through fear or remorse. The conspirators were seized and brought to trial before parliament. Sir William de Soulis and the countess of Strathern were condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Sir David de Brechin, Sir William Malherbe, Sir John Logie, and an esquire, named Richard Brown, were condemned to death, which they accordingly suffered. Four others of the principal conspirators were tried for their lives, and acquitted. Though the acquittal of these persons, and the clemency extended to the principal conspirator, afford every reason to believe that the trials were equitably if not favourably conducted, yet so little were men accustomed to consider the meditation of a mere change of government or innovation in the state as anything worthy of death, that the punishment seems to have been generally regarded as severe, and the common people gave the name of the Black Parliament to that by whose decrees so much noble blood had been spilled. The age, however accustomed to slaughter in the field, was less familiar with capital punishments which followed on the execution of the laws.

David de Brechin's fate excited much public sympathy. He was young, brave, connected with the blood royal, and had distinguished himself by his feats against the infidels in the Holy Land.

As the conspiracy of Sir William de Soulis and his accomplices was probably known to Edward of England, so there can be no doubt that Robert Bruce was participant of that which Thomas earl of Lancaster was carrying on against the former monarch. To this, perhaps, it was owing that commissioners appointed by both nations broke up their convention in 1321, without being able to settle the grounds on which the truce should be exchanged for a lasting peace.

[1323 A.D.]

As a king never stands more securely than on the ruins of a discovered and suppressed conspiracy, Edward now wrote to the pope to give himself no further solicitude to procure a truce or peace with the Scots, since he had determined to bring them to reason by force.

EDWARD'S DEFEAT: END OF THE TWENTY-THREE YEARS' WAR (1323 A.D.)

King Edward made extensive preparations for a campaign on a great scale. But while Edward was making preparations, the Scots were already in action. Randolph broke into the west marches with those troops to whom the road was become familiar, and hardly had they returned, when the king himself, at the head of one large body, advanced through the western marches into Lancashire, wasting the country on every side; while Douglas and Randolph, who entered the borders more to the east, joined him with a second division. They marched through the vale of Furness, laying everything waste in their passage, and piling their waggons with the English valuables. They returned into Scotland upon the 24th of July, after having spent twenty-four days in this destructive raid.

It was August, 1322, before King Edward moved northward, with a gallant army fit to have disputed a second field of Bannockburn. But Bruce not being now under an engagement to meet the English in a pitched battle, the reputation of his arms could suffer no dishonour by declining such a risk; and his sound views of military policy recommended his evading battle. He carefully laid the whole borders waste as far as the firth of Forth, removing the inhabitants to the mountains, with all their effects of any value. When the English army entered, they found a land of desolation, which famine seemed to guard. The king advanced to Edinburgh unopposed.

On their march the soldiers only found one lame bull. "Is he all that you have got?" said the earl Warrenne to the soldiers who brought in this solitary article of plunder. "By my faith, I never saw dearer beef."

At Edinburgh they learned that Bruce had assembled his forces at Culross, where he lay watching the motions of the invaders. The English had expected their ships in the firth, and waited for them three days. The vessels were detained by contrary winds, the soldiers suffered by famine, and Edward was obliged to retreat without having seen an enemy. They returned by the convents of Dryburgh and Melrose, where they slew such monks as were too infirm to escape, violated the sanctuaries, and plundered the consecrated plate.¹ This argues a degree of license which, in an army, seldom fails to bring its own punishment. When the English soldiers, after much want and privation, regained their own land of plenty, they indulged in it so intemperately, that sixteen thousand died of inflammation of the bowels, and others had their constitutions broken for life.

Robert Bruce hastened to retaliate the invasion which he had not judged it prudent to meet and repel. He pushed across the Tweed at the head of his army, and made an attempt upon Norham Castle, in which he failed. He learned, however, that the king of England was reposing and collecting forces at Biland Abbey, near Malton; and as the Scots, although they fought on foot, generally used in their journeys small horses of uncommon strength and hardihood, Robert, by a forced march, suddenly and unexpectedly placed himself in front of the English army. But they were admirably drawn

¹ The effect of these ravages was repaired by the restoration of the abbey church of Melrose, the beautiful ruins of which still show the finest specimens of Gothic architecture.

[1283-1296 A.D.]

up on the ridge of a hill, accessible only by a single, narrow, and difficult ascent. Bruce commanded Douglas to storm the English position. As he advanced to the attack he was joined by Randolph, who with four squires volunteered to fight under his command. Sir Thomas Ughtred and Sir Ralph Cobham, who were stationed in advance of the English army to defend the pass, made a violent and bloody opposition. But Bruce, as at the battle of Cruachan Ben, turned the English position by means of a body of Highlanders accustomed to mountain warfare, who climbed the ridge at a distance from the scene of action, and attacked the flank and rear of the English position.

King Edward with the utmost difficulty escaped to Bridlington, leaving behind him his equipage, baggage, and treasure. John of Bretagne, earl of Richmond, and Henry de Sully, grand butler of France, were made prisoners. The Steward of Scotland, at the head of five hundred Scottish men-at-arms, pursued the routed army to the walls of York, and knight-like (as the phrase then was) abode there till evening, to see if any would issue to fight. The Scots then raised an immense booty in the country, and once more withdrew to their own land loaded with spoil.

The sense of the difficulties with which he was surrounded at length induced Edward to become seriously desirous of a long truce, preparatory to a solid peace with Scotland. Henry de Sully, the French knight made prisoner at Biland Abbey, acted as mediator, and a truce was agreed upon, May 30th, at a place called Thorpe. The ratification, dated at Berwick, June 7th, 1323, was made by Bruce in the express and avowed character of king of Scotland, and was so accepted by the English monarch. The truce was concluded to endure for thirteen years.

RECONCILIATION WITH THE POPE; ALLIANCE WITH FRANCE

Bruce had now leisure to direct his thoughts towards achieving peace with Rome; for his being in the state of excommunication, though a circumstance little regarded in his own dominions, must have operated greatly to his disadvantage in his intercourse with other states and kingdoms of Europe. The king despatched to Rome his nephew, the celebrated Randolph earl of Moray, who conducted the negotiation with such tact and dexterity, that he induced the pope to address a bull to his royal relation under the long-withheld title of king of Scotland.

Randolph's talents for negotiation were also displayed in effecting a league between Scotland and France, which the circumstances of the times seemed strongly to recommend, and which was entered into accordingly. This French alliance was productive of events very prejudicial to Scotland in after ages, often involving the country in war with England when the interests of the nation would have strongly recommended neutrality. But these evil consequences were not so strongly apparent as the immediate advantage of securing the assistance and support of a wealthy and powerful nation, who were, like themselves, the natural enemies of England.

Scotland had now, what was a novelty to her stormy history, a continuance of some years of peace. Several changes took place in the royal family. The first and happiest was the birth of a son to Bruce, who afterwards succeeded his father by the title of David II. The joy of this event was allayed by the death of the king's son-in-law, the valiant Stewart. His wife, the princess Marjory, had died soon after the birth of her son in 1316. The Stewart's behaviour at Bannockburn, when almost a boy, at the siege of Berwick, where he defended the place against the whole force of England, at Biland

[1296-1297 A.D.]

Abbey, and on other occasions, had raised his fame high among the Scottish champions of that heroic period.

In consequence of these changes in the family of the king a parliament was held at Cambuskenneth in July, 1326, in which it is worthy of observation that the representatives of the royal boroughs for the first time were admitted; a sure sign of the reviving prosperity of the country, which has always kept pace with or rather led to the increasing importance of the towns. In this parliament the estates took their oath of fealty to the infant David, son of Robert Bruce, and failing him or his heirs, to Robert Stewart, son of

Walter Stewart, so lately lost and lamented, and Marjory, also deceased, the daughter of Robert by his first queen. The same parliament granted to the Bruce a tenth of the rents of all the lands of the kingdom of Scotland, to be levied agreeably to the valuation or extent, as it is termed, of Alexander III.



COSTUME IN TIME OF ROBERT BRUCE

EDWARD III FAILS IN AN INVASION (1327 A.D.)

In the year 1327 a revolution took place in the government of England, which had a strong effect on the relations between that kingdom and Scotland. Edward II, more weak than wilful, executed a compulsory resignation in favour of his son Edward III, and, thus dethroned, was imprisoned, and finally most cruelly murdered.

It is probable that Robert Bruce was determined to take advantage of the confusion occasioned by this convulsion in England to infringe the truce and renew the war, with

the purpose of compelling an advantageous peace. For this he wanted not sufficiently fair pretexts, though it may be doubted whether he would have made use of them had not the opportunity for renewing the war with a kingdom governed by a boy, and divided by factions, seemed so particularly inviting. His ostensible motives, however, were that although an article of the treaty at Thorpe, confirmed at Berwick, provided that the spiritual excommunication pronounced against Bruce should be suspended till the termination of the truce, yet Edward, by underhand measures at the court of Rome, had endeavoured to prejudice the cause of the Scottish king with the pontiff, and obstruct, if possible, the important object of his reconciliation with Rome. It was also alleged on the part of

[1287 A.D.]

Scotland, that the English cruisers had infringed the truce, by interrupting the commerce between Flanders and Scotland, and particularly by the capture of various merchant vessels, for which no indemnity could be obtained.

Negotiations for continuing the truce, or converting it into a final peace, which seems the point aimed at by Bruce, were finally broken off between the two kingdoms; and Edward III already, though in early youth, animated by the martial spirit which no king of England possessed more strongly, appointed his forces to meet at Newcastle before May 29th, 1327, alleging that the king of Scotland had convoked his army to assemble at that day upon the borders, in breach of the truce concluded at Thorpe. The rendezvous took place, however, at York, where a noble army convened under command of the young king, the future hero of Crécy, to which magnificent host had been added, at the expense of a large subsidy, five hundred men-at-arms from Hainault, who were then reckoned the best soldiers in Europe.

In the mean time the Scottish forces, to the number of two or three thousand men-at-arms, well mounted and equipped for a day of battle, and a large body of their light cavalry, amounting to more than ten thousand, with many followers, who marched on horseback, but fought on foot, invaded the western border, according to their custom, and penetrating through the wild frontier of Cumberland, came down upon Weardale, in the bishopric of Durham, marking their course with more than their usual ferocity of devastation. These forces, superior to all known in Europe for irregular warfare, were conducted by the wisdom, experience, and enterprising courage of the famed Randolph and "the good" Lord James Douglas, guided, doubtless, by the anxious instructions of the Bruce, who, though only fifty-three years of age, was affected by a disease of the blood then termed the leprosy, which prevented his leading his armies in person.

The king of England, on the other hand, at the head of a princely army of sixty thousand men, including five hundred belted knights, animated by the presence of the queen mother and fifty ladies of the highest rank, who witnessed their departure, set out from York, with the determination of chastising the invaders and destroyers of his country, in 1327. The high spirit of the youthful monarch was animated, besides, by a defiance which Bruce despatched to him by a herald, stating his determination to work his pleasure with fire and sword on the English frontiers.⁴

The account of the humiliating failure of English hopes has been fully recounted in Vol. 28. As there described, the Douglas penetrated the English camp, cut the ropes of the tent where the young king was asleep, and very nearly kidnapped him. Though he failed in this, he got safely away.^a

The English retreated to Durham, dejected and distressed, especially the knights and men-at-arms of Hainault, many of whom, instead of the praise and plunder they hoped to acquire, had lost their valuable horses and property. They were dismissed, however, with thanks and reward; and it is said these troops, notwithstanding their total inefficiency, had cost the kingdom of England a sum equal to 320,000*l.* sterling of modern money.

THE TREATY OF NORTHAMPTON RECOGNISES THE INTEGRITY OF SCOTLAND
(1328 A.D.)

King Edward III next convoked a parliament at York, in which there appeared a tendency on the part of England to concede the main points on which proposals for peace had hitherto failed, by acknowledging the independence of Scotland, and the legitimate sovereignty of Bruce. These dis-

[1327-1328 A.D.]

positions to reconciliation were much quickened by the sudden apparition of King Robert himself on the eastern frontier, where he besieged the castles of Norham and Alnwick, while a large division of his army burned and destroyed the open country, and the king himself rode about hunting from one park to another as if on a pleasure party. The parliament of York, although the besieged castles made a gallant defence, agreed upon a truce, which it was now determined should be the introduction to a lasting peace. As a necessary preliminary, the English statesmen resolved formally to execute a resignation of all claims of dominion and superiority which had been assumed over the kingdom of Scotland, and agreed that all muniments or public instruments asserting or tending to support such a claim should be delivered up.

This agreement was subscribed by the king on March 4th, 1328. Peace was afterwards concluded at Edinburgh on March 17th, 1328, and ratified at a parliament held at Northampton on May 4th, 1328. It was confirmed by a match agreed upon between the princess Joanna, sister to Edward III, and David, son of Robert I, though both were as yet infants.¹

Articles of strict amity were settled betwixt the nations, without prejudice to the effect of the alliance between Scotland and France. Bruce renounced the privilege of assisting rebels of England, should such arise in Ireland, and Edward the power of encouraging those of the isles who might rise against Scotland. It was stipulated that all the charters and documents carried from Scotland by Edward the first should be restored, and the king of England was pledged to give his aid in the court of Rome towards the recall of the excommunication awarded against King Robert. Lastly, Scotland was to pay a sum of twenty thousand pounds, in consideration of these favourable terms. The borders were to be maintained in strict order on both sides, and the fatal coronation stone was to be restored to Scotland.²

There was another separate obligation on the Scottish side, which led to most serious consequences in the subsequent reign. The seventh article of the Peace of Northampton provided that certain English barons, Thomas Lord Wake of Lidel, Henry de Beaumont earl of Buchan, and Henry de Percy should be restored to the lands and heritages in Scotland, whereof they had been deprived during the war by the king of Scots seizing them into his own hand. The execution of this article was deferred by the Scottish king, who was not, it may be conceived, very willing again to introduce English nobles as land-holders into Scotland. The English mob on their part resisted the removal of the fatal stone from Westminster, where it had been deposited; a pertinacity which "superstitious eld" believed was its own punishment, since with slow but sure attraction the mystic influence of the magnetic palladium drew the Scottish Solomon, James VI, to the sovereignty in the kingdom where it was deposited. The deed called Ragman's Roll, being the list of the barons and men of note who subscribed the submission to Edward the first in 1296, was, however, delivered up to the Scots; and a more important pledge, the English princess Joanna, then only seven years old, was placed in the custody of Bruce, to be united at a fitting age to her boy-bridegroom, David, who was himself two years younger.

The treaty of peace made at Northampton has been termed dishonourable to England by her historians. But stipulations that are just and necessary in themselves cannot infer dishonour, however disadvantageous they may be. The treaty of Northampton was just, because the English had no title to the superiority of Scotland; and it was necessary, because Edward III

[¹ David was probably five years old. Burton ^c sets the date of his birth at 1324, but Mackinnon ^t finds more evidence for 1323.]

[1338-1329 A.D.]

had no force to oppose the Scottish army, but was compelled to lie within the fortifications of York, and see the invaders destroy the country nearly to the banks of the Humber. What is alike demanded by justice and policy it may be mortifying but cannot be dishonourable to concede; and before passing so heavy a censure on the Northampton parliament, these learned writers ought to have considered whether England possessed any right over Scotland; and, secondly, whether that which they claimed was an adequate motive for continuing an unsuccessful war.

THE LAST DAYS OF ROBERT BRUCE (1329 A.D.)

Bruce seemed only to wait for the final deliverance of his country to close his heroic career. He had retired, probably for the purpose of enjoying a milder climate, to his castle of Cardross, on the firth of Clyde, near Dumbarton. Here he lived in princely retirement, and, entertaining the nobles with rude hospitality, relieved by liberal doles of food the distresses of the poor. Nautical affairs seem to have engaged his attention very much, and he built vessels, with which he often went on the adjacent firth. He practised falconry, being unequal to sustain the fatigue of hunting. We may add, for everything is interesting where Robert Bruce is the subject, that he kept a lion, and a fool named Patrick, as regular parts of his establishment. Meantime his disease (a species of leprosy, as we have already said, which had origin in the hardships and privations which he had sustained for so many years) gained ground upon his remaining strength.⁴

The Death of Bruce as Related by Froissart: Bruce's Heart

During this truce it happened that King Robert of Scotland, who had been a very valiant knight, waxed old, and was attacked with so severe an illness that he saw his end was approaching; he therefore summoned together all the chiefs and barons in whom he most confided, and after having told them that he should never get the better of this sickness, he commanded them, upon their honour and loyalty, to keep and preserve faithfully and entire the kingdom for his son David, and obey him and crown him king when he was of a proper age, and to marry him with a lady suitable to his station.

He after that called to him the gallant Lord James Douglas, and said to him, in presence of the others: "My dear friend, Lord James Douglas, you know that I have had much to do, and have suffered many troubles, during the time I have lived, to support the rights of my crown: at the time that I was most occupied I made a vow, the non-accomplishment of which gives me much uneasiness—I vowed that if I could finish my wars in such a manner that I might have quiet to govern peaceably, I would go and make war against the enemies of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the adversaries of the Christian faith. To this point my heart has always leaned; but our Lord was not willing, and gave me so much to do in my lifetime, and this last expedition has lasted so long, followed by this heavy sickness, that, since my body cannot accomplish what my heart wishes, I will send my heart in the stead of my body to fulfil my vow. And, as I do not know any one knight so gallant or enterprising, or better formed to complete my intentions than yourself, I beg and entreat of you, dear and special friend, as earnestly as I can, that you would have the goodness to undertake this expedition for the love of me, and to acquit my soul to our Lord and Saviour; for I

[1329 A.D.]

have that opinion of your nobleness and loyalty, that, if you undertake it, it cannot fail of success—and I shall die more contented; but it must be executed as follows:

"I will, that as soon as I shall be dead, you take my heart from my body, and have it well embalmed; you will also take as much money from my treasury as will appear to you sufficient to perform your journey, as well as for all those whom you may choose to take with you in your train; you will then deposit your charge at the Holy Sepulchre of our Lord, where he was buried, since my body cannot go there. You will not be sparing of expense—and provide yourself with such company and such things as may be suitable to your rank—and wherever you pass, you will let it be known that you bear the heart of King Robert of Scotland, which you are carrying beyond seas by his command, since his body cannot go thither."

All those present began bewailing bitterly; and when the Lord James could speak, he gave his promise upon his knighthood.

The king said: "Thanks be to God! for I shall now die in peace, since I know that the most valiant and accomplished knight of my kingdom will perform that for me which I am unable to do for myself."

Soon afterwards the valiant Robert Bruce, king of Scotland, departed this life on June 7th, 1329. His heart was embalmed, and his body buried in the monastery of Dunfermline.

Early in the spring the Lord James Douglas, having made provision of everything that was proper for his expedition, embarked at the port of Montrose, and sailed directly for Sluys in Flanders, in order to learn if any one were going beyond the sea to Jerusalem, that he might join companies. He remained there twelve days, and would not set his foot on shore, but stayed the whole time on board, where he kept a magnificent table, with music of trumpets and drums, as if he had been the king of Scotland. At last, after staying at Sluys twelve days, he heard that Alphonso, king of Spain, was waging war against the Saracen king of Granada. He considered, that if he should go thither he should employ his time and journey according to the late king's wishes; and when he should have finished there he would proceed further to complete that with which he was charged. He made sail, therefore, towards Spain, and landed first at Valentia; thence he went straight to the king of Spain, who was with his army on the frontiers, very near the Saracen king of Granada.

It happened, soon after the arrival of the Lord James Douglas, that the king of Spain issued forth into the fields, to make his approaches nearer the enemy; the king of Granada did the same; and each king could easily distinguish the other's banners, and they both began to set their armies in array. The Lord James placed himself and his company on one side, to make better work and a more powerful effort. When he perceived that the battalions on each side were fully arranged, and that of the king of Spain in motion, he imagined they were about to begin the onset; and as he always wished to be among the first rather than last on such occasions, he and all his company stuck their spurs into their horses, until they were in the midst of the king of Granada's battalion, and made a furious attack on the Saracens. He thought that he should be supported by the Spaniards; but in this he was mistaken, for not one that day followed his example. The gallant knight and all his companions were surrounded by the enemy: they performed prodigies of valour; but they were of no avail, as they were all killed. It was a great misfortune that they were not assisted by the Spaniards.

Lord Hailes adds another incident: The detached troops fought with

[1329 A.D.]

equal advantage, and the Moorish cavalry fled. Douglas with his companions eagerly pursued the Saracens. Taking the casket from his neck, which contained the heart of Bruce, he threw it before him and cried, "Now pass thou onward as thou wast wont, and Douglas will follow thee or die!" The fugitives rallied; surrounded and overwhelmed by superior numbers, Douglas fell, while attempting to rescue Sir William St. Clare, of Roslin, who shared his fate. Robert and Walter Logan, both of them knights, were slain with Douglas. His friend, Sir William Keith, having had his arm broke, was detained from the battle. His few surviving companions found his body in the field, together with the casket, and reverently conveyed them to Scotland. The remains of Douglas were interred in the sepulchre of his fathers, in the church of Douglas.

His natural son, Archibald Douglas, erected a marble monument to his memory; but his countrymen have more effectually perpetuated his fame, by bestowing on him the name of "the good Sir James Douglas." Fordun^u reports that Douglas was thirteen times defeated in battle, and fifty-seven times victorious.

Perhaps the reader will not dislike to see the portrait of Douglas, drawn by Barbour.¹

'In visage was he some deal gray,
And had black hair, as I heard say;
But then, of limbs he was well made,
With bones great, and shoulders braid;
His body well made and lenzie,
As they that saw him said to me.
When he was blyth, he was lovely,
And meek, and sweet in company;
But who in battle might him see,
Another countenance had he;
And in his speech he list some deal,
But that set him right wonder well."^s

TYTLER'S ESTIMATE OF BRUCE

At some interview, shortly before his death, Bruce delivered to the Scottish barons his last injunctions regarding the best mode of conducting the war against England. They concentrate, in a small compass, the wisdom and experience which he had gained during the whole course of his protracted but glorious war; and it is perhaps not too much to say that there is no instance in their subsequent history, in which the Scots have sustained any signal defeat, where it cannot be traced to a departure from some of the directions of what is affectionately called the Good King Robert's Testament. His injunctions were, that the Scots in their wars ought always to fight on foot; that, instead of walls and garrisons, they should use the mountains, the morasses, and the woods; having for arms the bow, the spear, and the battle-axe; driving their herds into the narrow glens, and fortifying them there, whilst they laid waste the plain country by fire, and compelled the enemy to evacuate it.

"Let your scouts and watches," he concluded, "be vociferating through the night, keeping the enemy in perpetual alarm; and, worn out with famine, fatigue, and apprehension, they will retreat as certainly as if routed in battle." Bruce did not require to add, that then was the time for the Scots to commence their attacks, and to put in practice that species of warfare which he had taught them to use with such fatal effect. Indeed, these are the principles of war which will in every age be adopted by mountaineers in defence

[1329 A.D.]

of their country; and nearly five hundred years after this, when a regular Russian army invaded Persia, we find the khan, Aga Mahommed, speaking to his prime minister almost in the very words of Bruce: "Their shot shall never reach me, but they shall possess no country beyond its range; they shall not know sleep; and let them march where they choose, I will surround them with a desert."

Bruce undoubtedly belongs to that race of heroic men, regarding whom we are anxious to learn even the commonest particulars. But living at so remote a period, the lighter shades and touches which confer individuality are lost in the distance. We only see, through the mists which time has cast around it, a figure of colossal proportion, walking amid his shadowy peers.

In his figure the king was tall and well shaped. Before broken down by illness, and in the prime of life, he was nearly six feet high. His forehead was low, his cheek-bones strong and prominent, and the general expression of his countenance open and cheerful, although he was maimed by a wound which had injured his lower jaw. His manners were dignified and engaging; after battle nothing could be pleasanter or more courteous; and it is infinitely to his honour, that in a savage age, and smarting under injuries which attacked him in his kindest and tenderest relations, he never abused a victory, but conquered often as effectually by his generosity and kindness as by his great military talents.

His memory was stored with the romances of the period, in which he took great delight. Their hair-breadth escapes and perilous adventures were sometimes scarcely more wonderful than his own, and he had early imbibed from such works an appetite for individual enterprise and glory, which, had it not been checked by a stronger passion, the love of liberty, might have led him into fatal mistakes. It is quite conceivable that Bruce, instead of a great king, might, like Richard the first, have become only a kingly knight-errant.

But from this error he was saved by the love of his country, directed by an admirable judgment, an unshaken perseverance, and a vein of strong good sense. It is here, although some may think it the homeliest, that we are to find assuredly the brightest part of the character of the king. It is these qualities which are especially conspicuous in his long war for the liberty of Scotland. They enabled him to follow out his plans through many a tedious year with undeviating energy; to bear reverses, to calculate his means, to wait for his opportunities, and to concentrate his whole strength upon one great point, till it was gained and secured to his country for ever. Brilliant military talent and consummate bravery have often been found amongst men, and proved far more of a curse than a blessing; but rarely, indeed, shall we discover them united to so excellent a judgment, controlled by such perfect disinterestedness, and employed for so sacred an end.

Immediately after the king's death his heart was taken out, as he had himself directed. He was then buried with great state and solemnity under the pavement of the choir, in the abbey church of Dunfermline, and over the grave was raised a rich marble monument, which was made at Paris. Centuries passed on; the ancient church, with the marble monument, fell into ruins, and a more modern building was erected on the same site. This gave way to time, and in clearing the foundation for a third church in 1819 the workmen laid open a tomb which proved to be that of Robert the Bruce. The lead coating in which the body was found enclosed was twisted round the head into the shape of a rude crown. A rich cloth of gold, but much decayed, was thrown over it, and, on examining the skeleton, it was found

[1304-1329 A.D.]

that the breast-bone had been sawn asunder to get at the heart. There remained, therefore, no doubt that, after the lapse of almost five hundred years, his countrymen were permitted, with a mixture of delight and awe, to behold the very bones of their great deliverer.⁹

SIR WALTER SCOTT'S ESTIMATE OF BRUCE

Remarkable in many things, there was this almost peculiar to Robert Bruce, that his life was divided into three distinct parts, which could scarcely be considered as belonging to the same individual. His youth was thoughtless, hasty, and fickle, and from the moment he began to appear in public life until the slaughter of the Red Comyn¹ and his final assumption of the crown, he appeared to have entertained no certain purpose beyond that of shifting with the shifting tide, like the other barons around him, ready, like them, to enter into hasty plans for the liberation of Scotland from the English yoke; but equally prompt to submit to the overwhelming power of Edward. Again, in a short but very active period of his life, he displayed the utmost steadiness, firmness, and constancy, sustaining, with unabated patience and determination, the loss of battles, the death of friends, the disappointment of hopes, and an uninterrupted series of disasters, on which scarce a ray of hope appeared to brighten. This term of suffering extended from the field of Methven-wood till his return to Scotland from the island of Rathlin, after which time his career, whenever he was himself personally engaged, was almost uniformly successful, even till he obtained the object of his wishes—the secure possession of an independent throne.

When these things are considered, we shall find reason to conclude that the misfortunes of the second or suffering period of Bruce's life had taught him lessons of constancy, of prudence, and of moderation, which were unknown to his early years, and tamed the hot and impetuous fire which his temper, like that of his brother Edward, naturally possessed. He never permitted the injuries of Edward I (although three brothers had been cruelly executed by that monarch's orders) to provoke him to measures of retaliation; and his generous conduct to the prisoners at Bannockburn, as well as elsewhere, reflected equal honour on his sagacity and humanity. His manly spirit of chivalry was best evinced by a circumstance which happened in Ireland, where, when pursued by a superior force of English, he halted and offered battle at disadvantage, rather than abandon a poor washerwoman, who had been taken with the pains of labour.

Robert Bruce's personal accomplishments in war stood so high that he was universally esteemed one of the three best knights of Europe during that martial age, and gave many proofs of personal prowess. His achievements seem amply to vindicate this high estimation, since the three Highlanders slain in the retreat from Dalry, and Sir Henry de Bohun, killed by his hand in front of the English army, evince the valorous knight, as the plans of his campaign exhibit the prudent and sagacious leader. The Bruce's skill in the military art was of the highest order; and in his [alleged and perhaps apocryphal] "testament," as it is called, he bequeathed a legacy to his countrymen,

[¹ Freeman * deals very bluntly with Bruce: "History (that is, real history) sets before us William Wallace as *quidam latro publicus* (a certain public robber), the savage devastator of England; it sets before us Robert Bruce as a traitor in turn to every cause, as a pardoned rebel, who at last took to patriotism as his only chance to escape the punishment of a treacherous private murder."]

which, had they known how to avail themselves of it, would have saved them the loss of many a bloody day.¹

If, however, his precepts could not save the Scottish nation from military losses, his example taught them to support the consequences with unshaken constancy. It is, indeed, to the example of this prince, and to the events of a reign so dear to Scotland, that we can distinctly trace that animated love of country which has been ever since so strong a characteristic of north Britons that it has been sometimes supposed to limit their affections and services so exclusively within the limits of their countrymen as to render that partiality a reproach which liberally exercised is subject for praise. In the day of Alexander III and his predecessors, the various tribes whom these kings commanded were divided from each other by language and manners; it was only by residing within the same common country that they were forced into some sort of connection; but after Bruce's death we find little more mention of Scots, Galwegians, Picts, Saxons, or Strathclyde Britons. They had all, with the exception of the Highlanders, merged into the single denomination of Scots, and spoke generally the Anglo-Scottish language.

This great change had been produced by the melting down of all petty distinctions and domestic differences in the crucible of necessity. In the wars with England all districts of the country had been equally oppressed, and almost all had been equally distinguished in combating and repelling the common enemy. There was scarce a district of Scotland that had not seen Bruce's banner displayed, and had not sent forth brave men to support it; and so extensive were the king's wanderings, so numerous his travels, so strongly were felt the calls on which men were summoned from all quarters to support him, that petty distinctions were abolished; and the state which, consisting of a variety of half-independent tribes, resembled an ill-constructed faggot, was now consolidated into one strong and inseparable stem, and deserved the name of a kingdom.

It is true that the great distinction between the Saxon and Gaelic races in dress, speech, and manner still separated the Highlander from his Lowland neighbour, but even this leading line of separation was considerably softened and broken in upon during the civil wars and the reign of Robert Bruce.

But the principal consolidating effect of this long struggle lay in the union which it had a tendency to accomplish between the higher and inferior orders. The barons and knights had, as we have before remarked, lost in a great measure the habit of considering themselves as members of any particular kingdom,

¹ These verses are thus given by Tytler. I have, for the sake of rendering them intelligible, adopted the plan of modern spelling, retaining the ancient language. The original verses are in Latin leonines.

On foot should be all Scottish war,
By hill and moss themselves to bear:
Let wood for walls be—bow and spear
And battle-axe their fighting gear:
That enemies do them no drear,
In strait place cause keep all store,
And burn the plain land them before;
Then shall they pass away in haste,
When that they nothing find but waste;
With wiles and wakening of the night,
And mickle noises made on height;
Then shall they turn with great affray,
As they were chased with sword away.
This is the council and intent
Of good King Robert's testament.

[1304-1329 A.D.]

or subjects of any particular king, longer than while they held fiefs within his jurisdiction. These loose relations between the nobles and their followers were altered and drawn more tight when the effect of long-continued war, repeated defeats, undaunted renewal of efforts, and final attainment of success, bound such leaders as Douglas, Randolph, and Stewart to their warriors, and their warriors to them. The faithful brotherhood which mutual dangers and mutual conquests created between the leader and the followers on the one hand, betwixt the king and the barons on the other—the consciousness of a mutual object which overcame all other considerations, and caused them to look upon themselves as men united in one common interest—taught them at the same time the universal duty of all ranks to their common country, and the sentiments so spiritedly expressed by Barbour,¹ the venerable biographer of Bruce himself:

Ah, freedom is a noble thing;
Freedom makes men to have liking
To man all solace freedom gives;
He lives at ease who freely lives;
And he that aye has livèd free
May not well know the misery,
The wrath, the hate, the spite, and all
That's compass'd in the name of thrall.⁴

A REVIEW OF SCOTCH COMMERCE AND CULTURE

We have mentioned in a former chapter the introduction of the Flemings into Scotland, and the impulse which they gave to the commencement of its manufactures and commerce. Malcolm Canmore and his queen also encouraged the arrival of foreign merchants into Scotland; David I was also distinguished for his attention to foreign commerce; and his burgh laws for the regulation of trade show not only his solicitude on this subject, but the important fact that the dyeing and manufacture of woollen cloth had been already introduced into Scotland.

So plentiful, also, was the trade in fish, already a source of national wealth, that during the same reign, as we learn from a MS. in the Cottonian library, the frith of Forth was often covered with boats manned by Scottish, English, and Belgian fishermen. Berwick was now the great Scottish port for foreign commerce, while Perth was properly as yet the capital of the kingdom, and a town distinguished for its wealth. Leith, Stirling, and Aberdeen are also mentioned as places possessing some trade and shipping. It was much, indeed, that such a country at the commencement of the reign of Richard I of England, could repurchase its independence for the then very large sum of ten thousand marks, and that in the succeeding reign of John it could pay fifteen thousand by the Treaty of Berwick.

Shipbuilding, too, seems to have been one of the departments of Scottish commercial enterprise, and Matthew Paris^w tells us that one of the large vessels which accompanied the fleet of St. Louis on his first crusade in 1286 had been built at Inverness for continental service. Nor, amidst this new stir of commerce and manufacture by which the country was enriched, were those arts neglected by which its manners were refined and softened.

Even at this early period music was a favourite study of the Scotch, while their musical instruments were the harp, the pib-corn, and the bagpipe. We are also informed by Giraldus^z Cambrensis, that the music of the Irish, who played only upon the harp with brass strings and the timbrel, was inferior to that of Scotland, for which reason they were wont to repair thither

[1292-1329 A.D.]

"as to the fountain-head of perfection in that art." In this way the progress of Scotland went onward from reign to reign, and all seemed to promise that her only contention with her powerful rival would be that which now so happily prevails—the contest of industry, and intelligence, and moral worth. But by one fatal accident all this was arrested and thrown back; and the first utterance of the Scottish muse in her own native tongue was a touching lamentation over the disaster:—

"Quhen Alysandyr, our Kyng, was dede,
That Scotland led in luive and Le,
Away wes sons of Ale and Brede,
Of Wyne and Wax, of Gamyn and Gle;
Oure gold was changyd into lede.
Cryst, born into virgynyte,
Succour Scotland and remede
That stad is in perplexyte!"

This was the death-wail of which Berwick was the funeral-pile. So great and prosperous had that town grown at the death of Alexander III, and so numerous were its inhabitants, that in the chronicle of Lanercost^v it is termed a second Alexandria. The sea, it added, was its wealth, the waters were its walls, and its rich citizens were very liberal in their donations to religious houses. But after its capture by Edward I, in 1296, and the indiscriminate massacre that followed, Berwick never recovered its consequence, but became a mere debatable town and place of strife between the English and the Scots. Then followed those long wars in which Scotland fought not merely for independence but existence, and in which every art and occupation were thrown aside, except those of self-defence and plunder; and a dreary interval had to elapse before her deeds were fitted for any other record than that of mere military achievement.

It is not, however, to be supposed that amidst the prevalent ignorance and barbarism which this death-struggle entailed upon the country for years, Scotland was merely illustrious by the deeds of Wallace, Bruce, and the Douglasses. On the contrary, the bright intellects whom she produced in her darkest hour gave a fair presage of what might be expected when happier days succeeded. One of these eminent men was Sir Michael Scott, of Balwearie, the contemporary of Roger Bacon, and, like him, not only distinguished by his scientific attainments, but also by the character of a magician and necromancer. His death occurred in 1292, the same year in which Bacon also deceased. Notwithstanding his exclusive renown among his own countrymen as seer, wizard, and necromancer, the works of Michael Scott, of which several have been printed, and the testimony of his learned contemporaries, prove him to have been one of the most acute intellects as well as one of the most learned and universal scholars of his day.

Another eminent northern genius of this period was John Duns Scotus, a man whom England and Ireland have been eager to claim for a native, and of whom any country might well be proud. It seems certain, however, that Scotland was his native country, as the name (Scotus) had long ceased to be applied to Ireland, and that the town of Dunse in Berwickshire was either his birth-place or residence. He was born in the latter part of the thirteenth century, but at what precise date cannot be ascertained. Having been instructed in the elements of learning by the Franciscan friars, who were struck with the early signs of acuteness which he exhibited, he was carried off a prisoner to England, along with his preceptors, in one of those destructive irruptions of the war of Edward I, in which neither priest nor

[1301-1399 A.D.]

layman was spared. After his liberation, John of Dunse repaired to Merton Hall, Oxford, and made such proficiency in the studies of logic, mathematics, and theology, that in 1301 he was appointed professor of divinity, and became so renowned as a lecturer on the sentences of Peter Lombard, that Oxford was crowded with students, of whom thirty thousand attended his prelections.

From Oxford he was sent to Paris by the Franciscans, to defend the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which he did with such logical acuteness that the impugnors were confuted, or at least confounded and silenced, and the honorary title of Subtle Doctor was conferred upon the successful champion. He had also a keen controversy on the subject of divine grace with Thomas Aquinas, in opposition to whose followers, called the Thomists, he founded a sect in theological science called the Scotists, who were soon diffused throughout all the churches and schools of Christendom.

Immense as were his writings and literary labours, Duns Scotus died at Cologne in 1308, while founding a university, being at that time not more than forty-four, or as others declare, only thirty-four years old. His written works alone, which were collected and published in 1639, filled twelve folio volumes!

It would be difficult, indeed, either to describe the almost religious adoration with which his authority was received, or the influence it exercised over the intellect of Europe in this period of struggle and transition: it was said of him, that he could have been the inventor of philosophy if it had not previously existed—that his knowledge of all the mysteries of religion was so profound and perfect that it was rather intuitive certainty than belief—and that he wrote so many books that one man is hardly able to read them, and no one man is able to understand them. Even, however, when the supremacy of Aristotle was passing away, and solid intellectual realities taking the place of idle sophisms, the writings of Duns Scotus held a high place, and were quoted with respect by the master spirits of the revolution. And such the feeling still continues to be, even in the present scrupulous age, among those who examine his mountainous tomes, and are able to appreciate them.

Very different from the pursuits of the preceding persons were those of John de Fordun.^a This worthy priest, a native of Fordun in Kincardineshire, and born about the middle of the fourteenth century, seems from his earliest days to have had a heart glowing with patriotism, as well as a mind directed to the writing of history. These feelings naturally suggested the great task of his life, which was to recover, if it were possible, the history of his native country—that history which Edward I had so mercilessly endeavoured to destroy. This, indeed, was a labour such as few national historians have encountered; and he set about it with a diligence and in a manner such as the task fully required. To find his materials he was obliged to traverse Britain and Ireland, pursuing his investigations from town to town, and from castle to castle, gathering whatever document, relic, story, or tradition was to be found about his native country, and securing them in his pilgrim's wallet for future consideration and arrangement.

After his quest was ended he sat down in Aberdeen, of the church of which he was a canon, and there, during the years between 1387 and 1399, employed himself in his important work, entitled the *Scotichronicon*, in five books, the last three being a history of Scotland from 1056 to 1153. Being arrested in his labour of love by the infirmity of old age, he handed over the rest of his materials to Walter Bower,^b who continued the *Scotichronicon* to the year 1436. A history undertaken under such singular disadvantages, as well as at such a credulous period, might be expected to abound in more

[1219-1286 A.D.]

than the ordinary share of fable; but still the full value of the work it is not easy to estimate. It secured those perishable national records which otherwise might have been irretrievably lost, and thereby became the groundwork of future Scottish histories.

In turning from philosophy and history to poetry, we find that there the fervour of the Scottish genius was not wanting. We have not the same means of ascertaining its early history in the northern as in the southern division of the island, but from the origin and character of the Scottish Lowlanders we are warranted in concluding that they, too, had their gleemen and troubadours, and that every district had its favourite lay or romance. It is still more interesting to find that the emancipation of the poetry of Britain from the old Saxon and Norman tongues into that which was finally to become the standard English language commenced, not in England but in Scotland.

The specimen we have already quoted as the oldest of the kind possesses a regularity of measure, and harmony of language, which the versification of England did not attain until more than a century afterwards. But we have not merely the small specimen alluded to for our warrant in the assertion that Scotland was properly the birthplace of English poetry. At the time when the lament on the death of Alexander III was written there was a poet of high eminence in Scotland, whose chief work, after having disappeared for centuries, was discovered and published in our own day. We allude to the poetical romance of *Sir Tristrem*, and its author, Thomas Rhymer.

Over the history of this early poet much of that mythic obscurity is to be found which so much aggrandised the names of Ossian and Homer. He is sometimes called Thomas the Rhymer from his poetical character, and Thomas of Ercildoune from the name of the village, now called Earliston, in Berwickshire, his place of residence. From early notices it may be inferred that he was born as early as 1219, and composed his poem about 1250, and that his life extended over a great part of that century, as we find him still alive at the period of the death of Alexander III in 1286. When we remember the original twofold application of the title *vates*, we need not be surprised if Thomas the Rhymer, in such a rude period, was reckoned a prophet as well as poet, and that from the natural love of the marvellous the former predominated over the latter character. His predictions were preserved, while his *Sir Tristrem* was allowed to sink into forgetfulness; and while subsequent authors continued to speak of him as a prophet, his predictions in rhyme were cherished like household treasures in Scottish cottages even till a very recent period. It was only perhaps the publication of his works by Sir Walter Scott which showed that "true Thomas" was a poet, and nothing more. With regard to the merits of *Sir Tristrem*, it is generally allowed that as it was the first, it was also the best of early Scottish poetical romances.

But the muse of Scotland soon found a more stirring as well as important occupation than the writing of chivalrous fictions. The terrible struggles that ensued on the death of Alexander III, and the long war of independence which Scotland waged against England, produced whole Iliads of warlike adventure, and veritable knights as gallant as those of the Round Table, while a spirit had been already evoked, and a language created every way fitted to express them. And when this war had ended, and ended so successfully for Scotland, it would have been strange if the country had produced no poet to raise the hymn of liberty, and record the deeds by which it had been achieved.

That poet was John Barbour,¹ archdeacon of Aberdeen. He is supposed to have been born in or near 1332 A.D., and was one of the commissioners

[1282-1375 A.D.]

appointed to treat with England about the ransom of David II. During his boyhood, therefore, many of the old veterans of the Bruce's wars must still have been alive, while the deeds of the hero himself, now fully appreciated by the deliverance they had wrought, must have been the theme of general conversation and eulogium. In a happy hour, accordingly, for Scotland and its history, he chose the deeds of the "good King Robert" for his theme; and the result was his poem of *The Bruce*, which he finished in 1375, when Scotland was under the peaceful reign of Robert II, and the English fully occupied with their conquests in France.

Besides its being a record of "soothfastness," as he assures us,—which he well might do from the recentness of the events,—the life of Bruce abounded in adventures sufficiently brilliant and wonderful for the purposes of poetry, so that while the worthy archdeacon produced a true history, his work was also a complete epic. Of the poetical merits of *The Bruce* it would now be needless to speak: these are so well attested that Barbour is now universally classed in the highest rank of epic poets. It is gratifying to find that poor though his country was, and illiterate though the people were reckoned, his patriotic task was not unrequited, for a yearly pension was assigned to him from the exchequer during life.*





CHAPTER VI

DAVID II AND THE BALIOLS

[1329-1371 A.D.]

"Early consolidation and perfect unity are, in one point of view, sources of great strength to a nation, as in the case of France. But, in another point of view, a nation may derive advantage from the independent action of different elements in its composition, down to a later period of its history. Wholesome checks are thus imposed upon tendencies which would otherwise become too dominant and give a one-sided character to civilisation; and questions are kept in some measure open which would otherwise be prematurely closed. Nothing seems more lamentable, to ordinary readers, than the death of that heiress of Scotland who was apparently destined to unite her country peacefully with England, by marrying the heir of Edward I. No doubt a union, if it had taken place at that time, would have spared the two countries several centuries of bloody and desolating wars. Yet, nothing contributed more than the distinct national character and distinct religion of the Scotch, to save Britain from being entirely subjugated by the absolutism of Stratford and the anglicanism of Laud. It was not in London, but in Edinburgh, that those conspirators first encountered serious resistance."—GOLDWIN SMITH.^b

DAVID II AND THE REGENTS

THE wise provision that Bruce made for the regency secured the peaceful succession of his son, David II (1329-1370), who was the first Scottish king anointed at his coronation—a privilege conceded to Bruce in a bull which reached Scotland after his death. According to the ideas of the age this placed the Scottish king on an equality with the sovereigns of Europe. The War of Independence quickened the sentiment of Scottish nationality, and left the country poorer in wealth, but richer in spirit. The memories of Wallace and of Bruce educated the people and produced in the next generation their earliest literature. England, unconscious of the benefit, gained by its own defeat. But for the resistance of the Scots it might have become earlier

[1329-1332 A.D.]

than France a centralised feudal monarchy. The distinct character of the Scots—a blend of the Celt, Saxon, Norseman, and Norman—strengthened by variety the collective force of Britain. The loss which must be balanced against the gain was the bitter hatred between two races of kindred origin within one narrow isle, which for centuries retarded the progress of both, especially of the smaller kingdom.⁶

The Regency of Randolph (1329-1332 A.D.)

The parliamentary settlement at Cambuskenneth had nominated Randolph [first earl of Moray] as regent of the kingdom, a choice which could not have been amended; but after-circumstances occasioned it to be much regretted that, by devolving on Douglas the perilous and distant expedition to Palestine, Bruce's request should have deprived the country of the services of the only noble who could have replaced those of the earl of Moray in case of death or indisposition. Scotland never lost a better worthy at a period when his services were more needed. Douglas united the romantic accomplishments of a knight of chivalry with the more solid talents of a great military leader. The good Lord James of Douglas left no legitimate issue; but a natural son of his, distinguished by the title of the knight of Liddesdale, makes an important figure in the following epoch, having inherited his father's military talents and courage, but unfortunately without possessing his pure and high-spirited sentiments of chivalrous loyalty.

Randolph assumed the government of Scotland with the cautious wisdom which might have been expected from his experience. He was conscious that Edward III, though prudently observing the Treaty of Northampton, felt its articles as a shameful dereliction of Edward I's claims, and that the people of England regarded it as a dishonourable composition, patched up by Queen Isabella and her usurping favourite, Mortimer, without regard to national honour, in order to get rid of the incumbrance of the Scottish war.

We have stated that an article in the Treaty of Northampton stipulated that the lords Beaumont and Wake of Liddel, with Sir Henry Percy [called the Disinherited], should be restored to their estates in Scotland, which had been declared forfeited by Robert Bruce. Of the three, Percy alone had been restored. It certainly appears that Robert Bruce had protracted the execution of this part of the Treaty of Northampton with a degree of delay, for which it was easy to assign reasons in policy, though it might have been difficult to support them in equity. But after Mortimer's fall, the restoration of Beaumont and Wake was positively demanded by the young king. The Scottish regent had by this time acquired information that the English lords in question and others had engaged in a conspiracy to invade Scotland, and dethrone, if possible, his youthful ward; a hostile enterprise which authorised Randolph to refuse the restitution demanded at such a conjuncture.

To understand the nature of this undertaking, the reader must be informed (and here a remarkable name in Scottish history again occurs) that John Baliol, for a short time the vassal king of Scotland, died in obscurity at his hereditary castle in Normandy, shortly after the decisive battle of Bannockburn, leaving a son, Edward. With the hope of intimidating Bruce, Edward II had sent to Normandy for this young man, who then displayed a bold and adventurous character; and the younger Baliol had accordingly appeared at the English court in 1324, and again in 1327, where, as the person among the Disinherited who in his father's deposition had suffered the greatest forfeiture of all, though not at the hand of King Robert, he naturally took a

[1332 A.D.]

lead in the undertaking of Wake, Beaumont, and the other lords and knights who like them desired restoration of Scottish estates, though they could not, like them, plead the advantage of the express clause in the Treaty of Northampton. These high-spirited and adventurous barons, assembling a small force of three hundred horse and a few foot soldiers, determined with such slender means to attempt the subjugation of a kingdom which had of late repeatedly defied the whole strength of England.

Although the attempt seemed a desperate one, the regent Randolph took even more than necessary pains to prepare for it. But the best means of resistance lay in his own high talents and long experience, and of the advantages of these his country was deprived in an evil hour. He died at Musselburgh, July 20th, 1332, when leading the Scottish army northward, to provide against the threatened descent of Baliol and his followers. A demise so critical was generally ascribed to poison; and a fugitive monk was pointed out as the alleged perpetrator of the deed.

The Disinherited Barons and Baliol's Victory at Dupplin Muir (1332 A.D.)

It seemed as if the sound governance, military talent, and even common defence of the Scottish people had died with Robert Bruce, Douglas, and Randolph. The veteran soldiers, indeed, survived, but without their leaders, and as useless as a blade deprived of its hilt: and the nobility, who had universally submitted to the talents of Randolph, now broke out into factious emulation. After much jealous cabal, Donald earl of Mar, a man of very ordinary talent, although nephew to Robert Bruce, was elevated to the regency. This took place at Perth; and the ill-omened election was scarce made when the Scots nobles learned that Baliol and the disinherited barons had entered the firth of Forth, disembarked at Kinghorn, defeated the earl of Fife, and, marching across the country, were encamped near Forteviot, July 31st, with the river Earn in their front. Their host had been joined by many adherents, but did not in all amount to more than three thousand men. With an army far more numerous, the earl of Mar encamped upon Dupplin Muir, on the opposite or right bank of the river; while a second army composed of southern barons, led by the earl of March, was arrived within eight miles of the enemy's left flank.

A more desperate situation could scarce be conceived than that of Baliol, and he relieved himself by a resolution which seemed to be as desperate. A stake planted by a secret adherent of the disinherited lords in a ford of the Earn indicated a secure place of crossing. The English army passed the river at midnight, August 12th, and in profound silence, surprised the camp of their numerous enemies, who were taken at unawares, dizzy with sleep and wassail; for they had passed a night of intemperance, and totally neglected posting sentinels. The English made a most piteous carnage among their unresisting enemies. The young earl of Moray showed the spirit of his father, and collecting his followers at the head of a dauntless but small body, drove back the enemy. But the incapacity of the earl of Mar, who in the doubtful light of the dawning bore down in a confused mass without rule or order, overwhelmed instead of supporting Randolph and his little body of brave adherents. Opposition ended, the rout became totally irretrievable, and the swords of the enemy were blunted with slaughter.* After

[* Among the slain were Randolph, earl of Moray; Robert Bruce's natural son, the earl of *Carriek*; Robert Bruce's brother-in-law, the earl of Menteith, and the regent himself, the earl of Mar.]

[1332 A.D.]

the battle of Dupplin Muir the invaders took possession of Perth without opposition.

The earl of March dispersed his army, and afterwards showed his real sentiments by acceding once more to the English interest.

The foreign invasion having thus succeeded, though made on a scale wonderfully in contrast with the extent of the means prepared, the domestic conspiracy was made manifest. The family of Comyn in all its branches, all who resented the proceedings against David de Brechin and the other conspirators condemned by the Black Parliament; all who had suffered injury, or what they termed such, in the disturbed and violent times, when so much evil was inflicted and suffered on both sides; all, finally, who nourished ambitious projects of rising under the new government, or had incurred neglect during the old one, joined in conducting Edward Baliol to Scone, where he was crowned king in their presence, when Sinclair, prelate of Dunkeld, whom the Bruce on account of his gallantry termed his own bishop, officiated at the ceremony of crowning an usurper, to the prejudice of his heroic patron's son.

Edward Baliol, in temporary possession of the Scottish crown, speedily showed his unworthiness to wear it. He hastened to the border, to which Edward III was now advancing, with an army, to claim the lion's share among the Disinherited barons, to whom he had afforded private countenance in their undertaking, and whose ultimate success was finally to depend upon his aid. Unwarned by his father's evil fortune, Edward Baliol renewed in all form the subjugation of the kingdom of Scotland, took on himself at Roxburgh, November 23rd, 1332, the feudal fetters which even his father had found it too degrading to endure; and became bound, under an enormous penalty, to serve King Edward in his wars, he himself with two hundred, and his successors with one hundred men-at-arms, and to extend and strengthen the English frontiers by the cession of Berwick, and lands to the annual amount of two thousand pounds. Having made this mean bargain with the king of England, and thereby, as he thought, secured himself the powerful assistance of that nation, Baliol was lying carelessly encamped at Annan, when he was surprised by a body of royalist horse, which had assembled at Moffat. Edward himself was fain to escape to the English borders, almost naked, an exile and a fugitive, having scarcely possessed his usurped crown for three months.

Meantime the royalists had found a trustworthy leader in Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell. In his youth he had been the companion of Wallace, and afterwards the faithful follower of Bruce, who acknowledged his attachment by preferring him to the hand of his sister Christina, a widow, by the death of the heroic Christopher Seaton. Sir Andrew Moray was a soldier of the Bruce's school, calm, sagacious, and dauntlessly brave. His first measure of importance was to remove the persons of the young king and queen to France, where the faith of Philip was engaged for their safety and honourable maintenance. His next undertaking was less fortunate. He made an attempt to take by surprise the castle of Roxburgh, into which Baliol had then thrown himself, and imprudently engaged his own person in the dangerous enterprise.

He was made prisoner to the infinite prejudice of the royal cause; his place being poorly supplied by Archibald Douglas, although a brave soldier, and brother to the good Lord James. It was a great additional misfortune that a short time after, in a severe battle which was fought on the borders, the knight of Liddesdale (Sir William Douglas, natural son of the good Lord James) was defeated in a considerable action and made prisoner. He was

[1333 A.D.]

treated with great rigour and detained captive for two years. Thus was Scotland deprived, in her hour of utmost need, of two more of her choicest soldiers.

THE ENGLISH RECONQUER SCOTLAND AT HALIDON HILL (1333 A.D.)

Edward III now prepared to assist his vassal Baliol, and assembling a large army, May, 1333, came before Berwick, the securing of which place the Scots deemed justly an object of primary consequence, since Baliol had consented to surrender it to England. The earl of March, whose apostasy was not yet suspected, was governor of the castle of Berwick, and Sir Alexander Seaton of the town. They defended the place strenuously, and burned a large vessel with which the English assaulted the walls from the sea. But the garrison were reduced to such distress that they were compelled, according to the custom of the time, to agree to surrender, if not relieved by a certain day, and hostages were delivered to that effect, the son of Seaton the governor being one.

Forgetting or disregarding the earnest admonition of King Robert, the regent Douglas resolved to commit the fate of the country to the risk of a decisive conflict. On crossing the Tweed, July 19th, and approaching Berwick on the northern side, the Scottish regent became aware of the army of England drawn up in four great battalions, with numerous bodies of archers to flank them. The ground which they occupied was the crest of an eminence called Halidon Hill. The Scots stationed themselves on the opposite ridge of high ground: the bottom which divided the hills was a morass. On the morning of the 20th the Scots, with inconsiderate impetuosity, advanced to the onset. By doing so they exposed their whole army—whilst descending the hill and crossing the morass—to the constant and formidable discharge of the English archers, against whom they had no similar force to oppose. The inevitable consequence was that they lost their ranks, and became embarrassed in the morass, where many were slain. But the nobles, who fought on foot in complete armour at the head of their followers, made a desperate effort to lead a great part of the army through the bog, and ascended the opposite hill. They came to close battle with the English, who, calm and in perfect order, were not long in repulsing an attack made by disordered ranks and breathless soldiers. The Scottish, after finding their efforts vain, endeavoured to retreat. In the mean time the pages and camp-followers, who held the horses of the combatants, seeing the battle lost, began to fly, and carry off the horses along with them, without respect to the safety of their masters; so that the carnage in this bloody battle was very great, and numbers of the gentry and nobility fell.

The venerable earl of Lennox, the faithful companion of Robert Bruce, the earls of Ross, Carrick, Sutherland, Menteith, and Athol,¹ were all slain, together with knights and barons to a countless number, and all with a trifling loss on the part of the English. The regent, Douglas himself, wounded and made prisoner, died soon after he was taken. Berwick surrendered in consequence of this decisive action, and the earl of March, governor of the castle, returned openly to the English interest, and was admitted to Edward's favour and confidence.

The Scots had suffered a loss in this action which was deemed by the English totally irrecoverable.¹ "The Scottish wars are ended," said an

[¹ The defeat of Halidon Hill undid for a time the whole work of Bruce in Scotland, and it was only the memory and inspiration of his example that saved her.—HUME BROWN.]

[1333-1334 A.D.]

English historian, "since no one of that nation remains having interest enough to raise an army, or skill sufficient to command one." Through all Scotland, so lately the undisputed dominions of the Bruce, only four castles and a strong tower which did not reach to the importance of such a title, remained in possession of the royalists who adhered to his unfortunate son.^g

The measures which Edward adopted on making himself master of Berwick were little calculated to conciliate the minds of those whom he somewhat prematurely considered as a conquered people. He seized and forfeited the estates of all the barons in the county of Berwick, who held their property by charter from King Robert; in giving leases of houses within the town, or of lands within the shire, he prohibited his tenants and vassals from subleasing them to any except Englishmen; he directed the warden of the town to collect together all the Scottish monks whom he suspected of instilling rebellious principles into their countrymen, and to transport them to England, to be there dispersed amongst the monasteries of their respective



CASTLE URQUHART, LOCH-NESS
Besieged in 1334 by the English

orders on the south side of the Trent; and he commanded the chiefs of the different monastic orders in England to depute to Scotland some of their most talented brethren, who were capable of preaching pacific and salutary doctrines to the people, and of turning their hostility into friendship. Orders were also transmitted to the magistrates of London and other principal towns in the kingdom, directing them to invite merchants and traders to settle in Berwick, under promise of ample privileges and immunities; and, in the anticipation that these pacific measures might still be inadequate to keep down the spirit of resistance, he emptied the prisons throughout England of several thousands of criminals condemned for murder and other heinous offences, and presented them with a free pardon on the condition of their serving him in his Scottish wars.^h

Amid this scene of apparent submission Edward Baliol held a mock parliament at Edinburgh, February 10th, 1334, for the gratification of his ally, the king of England. The obligation of homage and feudal service to the king of England was undertaken by Edward Baliol in the fullest extent; the town of Berwick was given up; and as King Edward was desirous to hold a large portion of Scotland under his immediate and direct authority, Baliol, by a solemn instrument, made an absolute surrender to England of the frontier provinces of Berwickshire, Roxburghshire, Selkirkshire, Peebleshire, and Dumfriesshire, together with Lothian itself, in all its three divisions, thus yielding up the whole land between the northern and southern Roman rampart, and restricting Scotland to the possessions beyond the estuaries of Forth and Clyde, inhabited of old by the free Caledonians. For the rem-

[1334-1335 A.D.]

nants of the kingdom, thus mutilated and dismembered, Baliol paid homage. At the same parliament Baliol, by ample cessions and distributions of territory, gratified the Disinherited lords, to whose valour he owed his extraordinary success. A quarrel arose amongst these proud barons which had important consequences.

SCOTLAND RISES AGAIN UNDER MORAY (1334 A.D.)

About this time Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, made prisoner, as we have seen, at Roxburgh, escaped or was liberated from prison; and his appearance in Scotland, with the discord among the English barons, was a signal for a general insurrection of the royalists. Moray was joined by the discontented Mowbray. Richard Talbot, marching southward, was attacked and defeated by William Keith of Galston, who had distinguished himself at the siege of Berwick. Sir Andrew Moray, with his new ally, Mowbray, besieged the powerful Henry de Beaumont in his fortress of Dundearg in Buchan, and by cutting off the supplies of water compelled him to surrender, and put him to a great ransom. The impulse became general through Scotland. The men of Bute arose against the English captain, slew him, and sent his head to their master, the Stewart of Scotland. In Annandale and in Ayrshire, where Bruce had his family estates, the royalists gathered on every side.

The Stewart had distinguished himself by his bravery and generosity of disposition. By universal approbation of the royalists this gallant and amiable young man was associated in the regency. The young earl of Moray, son of the heroic Randolph, was returned from France, whither he had fled after the battle of Halidon Hill, and pushed David Hastings of Strathbogie so hard, that he not only compelled him to surrender, but found means to induce him to join the conqueror. Baliol fled into England, thereby showing plainly how slight was his reliance on any support save such as came from that kingdom, and how steadily the great bulk of the Scottish nation were attached to the legitimate heir of Bruce.

Edward III advanced into Scotland November, 1334. He met no opposition, for the Scots brought no army to the field; but he was assailed by want and the stormy weather incident to the season; and so little was Edward's reputation raised by this incursion, that the earl of March, a nobleman uniformly guided by his own interest, chose that very crisis to renounce the allegiance of England.

The chiefs of the loyal Scots now assembled a parliament at Dairsie, in Fife, April, 1335, in order to settle upon a combined plan of operations for the liberation of the country. But their counsels came to no useful or steady result, chiefly owing to the presumption of David de Strathbogie, earl of Athol, who assumed a species of superiority which the Scottish nobles could not endure. The parliament broke up in great disorder. It may be that this discord was attended with some consequences indirectly advantageous to Scotland. As the parliament could not agree upon raising a large army, they could not commit the imprudence of risking a general action. In the summer succeeding, Edward again invaded Scotland on the east marches, July 1st, 1335; while Baliol, with a body of Welsh troops and foreigners, entered on the west. They laid waste the country with fire and sword with emulous severity. The Scots kept King Robert's testament in recollection; and lurking among the woods and valleys, they fell by surprise upon

[1235-1237 A.D.]

such English as separated themselves from the main body, or straggled from the march in their thirst for plunder.

In the end of July a large body of Flemish men-at-arms landed at Berwick, in the capacity of auxiliaries to England. These strangers, commanded by Guy count of Namur, conceiving the country entirely undefended, advanced fearlessly to Edinburgh, at that time an open town, the castle having been demolished. Count Guy had scarce arrived there when an army of Scottish royalists, commanded by the earls of Moray and March and Sir Alexander Ramsay, attacked him. The battle took place on the Borough Moor, and was fiercely disputed for some time; till the knight of Liddesdale, who had escaped or been released from his English captivity, swept down from the Pentland Hills, and turned the scale of battle. The Flemings retired into the city, and fought their way as they retreated up to the hill where the castle lay in ruins. They were speedily obliged to capitulate. The Scots treated their valiant prisoners with much courtesy, releasing them on their parole not to fight against David, and sending an escort to see the foreigners safe into England.

Unhappily, the regent earl of Moray went himself with the party, and on his return towards Lothian, after dismissing the Flemings, was made prisoner and thrown into Bamborough Castle. Thus the services of the worthy successor of Randolph were, for a time, lost to his country. The English continued their ravages, and with such success that men were reduced to use that sort of lip-homage which the heart refuses. "If you asked a grown-up person," says an old historian, "who was his king, he dared make no other answer save by naming Edward Baliol; while the undissembling frankness of childhood answered the same question with the name of David Bruce."

Scotland being in this low condition, and Edward having received the submission of the versatile earl of Athol, restored to that powerful nobleman his large English estates, and named him regent or governor of Scotland under Baliol. The Stewart, over whom this David de Strathbogie seems to have possessed but too much influence, was also induced, contrary to his interests, as nearly concerned in the succession, to acknowledge Baliol as his sovereign. After fortifying Perth, and rebuilding the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling, Edward the third returned to his own dominions.

The irresistible pressure of immediate superiority of force being once more removed, the spirit of determined resistance began again to manifest itself. The Scottish loyalists once more chose for their head Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell. Moray, joined by the earl of March and the knight of Liddesdale, came suddenly on the earl of Athol, then lying in the forest of Kilblain, whose troops, suddenly and fiercely attacked in a species of pass, gave way on all sides. The earl of Athol was steady in personal courage, though fickle in political attachment: he looked round with scorn on his fugitive followers, and striking his hand on a huge rock which lay near him said, "Thou and I will this day fly together." Five knights of his household abode fought, and fell with him, refusing all quarter. Edward himself advanced to avenge the death of a powerful, if not a steady, partisan. He led into Scotland a numerous army, which wasted the country as far as Moray, carrying devastation wherever he went. But he had then done the utmost which was in his power, and was compelled to retreat by the consequences to his own army of the very desolation which they themselves had made. But no sooner was the weight and presence of the English host withdrawn than all the Scottish patriots were again in arms in every quarter of the country, assaulting and storming, or surprising by stratagem, the garrisons that had been left to overawe them,

[1267-1289 A.D.]

and proving that they were worthy to have been subjects of the Bruce, by the intelligence with which they executed his precepts. The regent distinguished himself in this war as much by his alertness in seizing opportunities of advantage, as he had done when opposed to Edward by the prudence which affords none to the enemy.

In the mean time war broke out between France and England. On October 7th, 1337, King Edward publicly asserted his claim to the throne of that kingdom; yet, with this new and more dazzling object in his view, he did not turn his eyes from the conquest of Scotland. The earls of Salisbury, Arundel, and Norfolk were intrusted with the command of the northern army, and the former laid siege to the strong castle of Dunbar, defended, in the absence of the earl of March, by his wife, the daughter of the heroic Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, and animated by a portion of his courage.

This lady, whom the common people used to call Black Agnes of Dunbar, was one of those by whose encouragement, according to a phrase of Froissart,⁶ a man may become of double strength in the hour of danger. She daily made the round of the walls in sight of besiegers and besieged, and caused the maidens of her train to wipe the battlements with their handkerchiefs, when the stones from the engines struck them, as if in scorn of the English artillery. At one time, by engaging him in a pretended plot to receive surrender of the castle from a traitorous party within, she had well nigh made the earl of Salisbury her prisoner. On another occasion, an arrow shot by an archer of her train struck to the heart an English knight, in spite of his being completely armed. "There goes one of my lady's tiring-pins," said Montague, earl of Salisbury: "the countess's love-shafts pierce to the heart."

The good knight Sir Alexander Ramsay contrived, by means of a light vessel and a dark night, to throw into the castle a supply of provisions and soldiers. This was announced to the besiegers by a sally; and they were so much disheartened as to raise the siege, which had lasted five months, and retire from before Dunbar with little honour.

Similar advantages were gained by the patriots all through Scotland. The state, indeed, sustained a heavy loss in the death of Sir Andrew Moray, the regent, who, after all his battles and dangers, expired in peace at his castle of Avoch, in Ross. Brother-in-law of the Bruce, and one of the last of his leaders, he evinced till his dying day the spirit of valour, sagacity, and patriotism which merited that distinguished alliance.

REGENCY OF ROBERT THE STEWART OF SCOTLAND

The Stewart of Scotland, freed from the baneful influence which the anglicised earl of Athol had exercised over him, was now chosen sole regent, and showed himself worthy of the trust. He commenced the siege of Perth, assisted by five ships of war and some men-at-arms, which were sent from France. The regent was assisted in pressing this siege by the abilities of William Bullock, an ecclesiastic who loved the battlefield or the political scenes of the cabinet better than mass or matins. He showed the hardihood of his character during a total eclipse of the sun, which took place in the midst of his operations. While all others, both in the besieging army and garrison, were sinking under their superstitious fears, Bullock took advantage of the darkness to wheel his military engines so close to the wall that when the sunshine returned the besieged found themselves under the necessity of surrendering. The Stewart was equally successful in reducing Stirling

[1299-1341 A.D.]

and other English posts to the north of the Forth, and bringing the whole country to the peace of King David.

Other Scottish leaders distinguished themselves in different provinces. Sir William Douglas, the knight of Liddesdale, totally expelled the English from Teviotdale. A still more important acquisition on the Scottish part was that of Edinburgh Castle, which Edward III had fortified when in Scotland during his last campaign.

Sir Alexander Ramsay, the same who gallantly relieved the castle of Dunbar, yielded to none of the champions whom we have named in devotion to the cause of his country. His fame for chivalry was so high, that no Scottish youth of that neighbourhood was held worthy of esteem unless he had proved his gallantry by riding for some time in Ramsay's band.

THE RETURN OF THE YOUNG KING DAVID II (1341 A.D.)

By the achievements of these brave men the English force was so much weakened throughout Scotland, and the government of the legal monarch so completely restored, that it was thought advisable that King David and his consort should return from France to their own kingdom.' They landed at the small port of Inverbervie in Kincardineshire in the month of May, 1341.

In the same spring Sir Alexander Ramsay added to his long list of services the important acquisition of the castle of Roxburgh, which, according to the desperate fashion of the times, he took by escalade.

Unhappily the mode which the young and inexperienced king took to reward this gallant action proved fatal to the brave knight by whom it was achieved. David conferred on Ramsay the sheriffdom of Roxburgh as a fitting distinction to one who had taken the principal fortress of the county. The knight of Liddesdale, who had large possessions in Roxburghshire, and pretensions by his services to the sheriffdom, was deeply offended by the preference given to Ramsay. He came upon Sir Alexander Ramsay, accompanied with an armed force, while he was exercising justice at Hawick, dispersed his few attendants, wounded him while on the bench of justice, threw him on a horse, and through many a wild bog and mountain path carried him to his solitary and desolate castle of the Hermitage, where he cast him into the dungeon of that lonely and darksome fortress. The noble captive was left with his rankling wounds to struggle with thirst and hunger, supporting for some time a miserable existence by means of grain which fell from a granary above, until death relieved him from suffering.

The most disgraceful part of this hideous story remains to be told. David, whose favour, imprudently evinced, had caused the murder of the noble Ramsay, saw himself obliged, by the weakness of his government and the pressure of the disorderly times, not only to pardon the inhuman assassin, but to grace him with the keeping of the castle of Roxburgh, which the valour

[¹ Both Scotland and its king owed much to the steadfastness with which Philip had championed their cause. But for the intervention of France, and the outbreak of the Anglo-French conflict, Scotland would have been hard beset in the unequal struggle with its southern neighbor, though the evidence it had given of its marvellous powers of resistance, even before Philip threw down the gauntlet, was sufficiently galling to English prestige. It would ill become us to repeat the depreciative and often malignant aspersions of the English chroniclers and historians because he manfully refused to own himself a usurper at his English vassal's summons, and faithfully championed the rights of his young *protégé* of Scotland.—MACKINSON.]

of his murdered victim had won from the enemy, and the sheriffdom of the county, which was rendered vacant by his murder.

A fate similar to that of Ramsay was sustained by a victim less deserving of pity. Bullock, the fighting ecclesiastic, who had deserted the standards of England for those of Scotland, and had taken so great a share in the reduction of Perth, was suddenly, by the royal order, seized on by Sir David Berkeley, thrown into the castle of Lochendorb in Morayshire, and there, like Ramsay, starved to death.^a

It is difficult to imagine a more lamentable picture than that presented by the utter desolation of Scotland at this period. The famine, which had been felt for some years, now raged in the land. Many of the Scots had quitted their country in despair, and taken refuge in Flanders; others, of the poorer sort, were driven into the woods, and, in the extremities of hunger, feeding like swine upon the raw nuts and acorns which they gathered, were seized with diseases which carried them off in great agony. The continued miseries of war reduced the country round Perth to the state of a desert, where there was neither house for man nor harbour for cattle, and the wild deer coming down from the mountains resumed possession of the desolate region, and ranged in herds within a short distance of the town.

It is even said that some unhappy wretches were driven to such extremities of want and misery as to prey upon human flesh; and that a horrid being, vulgarly called Christicleik, from the iron hook with which he seized his victims, took up his abode in the mountains, and, assisted by a ferocious female with whom he lived, lay in ambush for the travellers who passed near his den, and methodically exercised the trade of a cannibal. The story is perhaps too dreadful for belief, yet Wyntoun,⁴ who relates it, is in no respect given to the marvellous; and a similar event is recorded as late as the reign of James the second.^b

These wretched cannibals were detected, condemned, and burned to death. Famine, and the wretched shifts by which men strove to avoid its rage, brought on disease, their natural consequence. A pestilence^c swept the land in 1350 and destroyed many of the enfeebled inhabitants, while others emigrated to France and Flanders, forsaking a country on which it seemed to have pleased Heaven to empty the bitterest vials of its wrath. And the termination of these misfortunes was far distant.^d

The almost contemporaneous reigns of David II and Edward III reversed the position of the two countries: Scotland had now one of its feeblest and England one of its most powerful kings. Had not the love of liberty become the life-blood of both nobles and commons in Scotland it must have succumbed in the desperate struggle.^e

David the second was, as might be expected from the son of Robert Bruce, dauntlessly intrepid. He possessed a goodly person (a strong recommendation to the common people), and skill in martial exercises. But his education at the court of France had given him an uncontrollable love of pleasure. He was young also, being only about eighteen when he landed at Inverbervie, and totally inexperienced. Such was the situation and disposition of the juvenile king of a country at once assailed by foreign war with an enemy of superior force, by civil faction and discord in its most frightful shape, by raging pestilence and wasting famine. It was only the additional curse of a weak and imprudent prince that could have added fresh gall to so much

[¹ This was the famous Black Death which ravaged Europe. In Scotland it was called, before it reached north, "the foul death of the English"; after that it was called "the first pestilence."]

[1346 A.D.]

bitterness. The ablest and most trustworthy counsellor whom David could have consulted was unquestionably the Stewart, who had held the regency till he resigned it on the king's arrival. But, failing heirs of David's body, of which none as yet existed, the Stewart was heir of the throne, and princes seldom love or greatly trust their successors when not of their own immediate family.

DAVID INVADES ENGLAND AND IS CAPTURED AT NEVILLE'S CROSS (1346 A.D.)

As Edward was absent in France, the time had seemed favourable for an attack upon the frontiers. Several attempts were made without decisive success on either side, which led to a truce of two years, ending on Martinmas, 1346. This cessation of arms was made between England and France, and Scotland was included. David and his subjects, however, became weary of the truce, which was broken off by a fierce incursion of the knight of Liddesdale into England. In 1346 David prepared for an invasion upon a much larger scale, and summoned the whole array of Scotland, whether highland or lowland, to assemble at Perth. David's army marked its progress by the usual course of ferocious devastation, the more censured in that age, because the patrimony of Saint Cuthbert experienced no favour or protection. The great northern barons of England, Percy and Neville, Musgrave, Scrope, and Hastings, assembled their forces in numbers sufficient to show that, though the conqueror of Crécy with his victorious army was absent in France, there were Englishmen enough left at home to protect the frontiers of his kingdom from violation.



King David advanced to the park called Beaurepaire, near Durham (by corruption Bear Park), and took up his quarters there, although the ground was so intersected by inclosures as to render it difficult to draw up the troops in order, and impossible for the divisions duly to support each other.

The knight of Liddesdale had advanced, on the morning of October 17th, 1346, with four hundred men-at-arms, to collect forage and provisions, when, at Neville's Cross, he unexpectedly found himself in presence of the whole English army. He was attacked, charged, routed, and suffered great loss. He and the remains of his division had but time to gallop into the Scottish camp and give the alarm, when the enemy were upon them.

The Scottish army was hastily drawn up in three divisions, as well as the broken and subdivided nature of the ground permitted. The right was commanded by the earl of Moray; the centre by the king in person; the left by Liddesdale, the Stewart of Scotland, and the earl of Dunbar. This arrangement was hardly accomplished ere the English archers, to the number of ten thousand, came within sight.

The numerous inclosures cramped and interrupted the Scottish system of defence, and at length the right wing, under the earl of Moray, began to fly. The English cavalry broke down on them, and completed the rout. Amid repeated charges, and the most dispiriting slaughter by the continuous discharge of the English arrows, David showed that he had the courage though not the talents of his father. He was twice severely wounded with arrows, but continued to encourage to the last the few of his peers and officers who were still fighting around him. At length, in a close *mêlée*, a Northumberland knight, named Copland, grappled with David and made him prisoner, but not before the king had struck out two of Copland's front teeth.

On the fall of the royal banner, the Stewart and the earl of March, who had not as yet sustained much loss, despairing of being able to aid the king or restore the battle, withdrew from the field in tolerable order, and carried their division and such as rallied under their standards back into Scotland. David II, it has been thought, considered this retreat as resembling a desertion, the more suspicious, as the next heir to the crown was at its head. The captive king was conveyed to London, and afterwards, in solemn procession to the Tower, attended by a guard of twenty thousand men, and all the city companies in complete pageantry. There remained slain on the fatal field of Neville's Cross the earls of Moray and Strathearn, David de la Hay the high constable of Scotland, Robert Keith the great marshal, the chamberlain, and the chancellor, with very many men of rank. Of the lower classes, at least fifteen thousand are computed to have fallen.

The nation of Scotland was but beginning to draw its breath after its unparalleled sufferings during the civil war, when it was, to all appearance, totally prostrated by the blow to which David had imprudently exposed his realm. The whole border counties of Scotland surrendered themselves without attempting an unavailing defence. The line of the frontiers was carried northward to the southern borders of Lothian, and was afterwards pushed still farther north. The king of England abused his victory by cruelty. He brought two of his noble captives, the earls of Menteith, and Duncan earl of Fife, to trial, for having turned to Bruce's party, after having been liegemen to Baliol. Both earls were convicted of high treason, and the earl of Menteith suffered the hideous punishment annexed to that crime by the English law. Yet while thus severely punishing those who had been traitors, as it was called, to Baliol, Edward had no purpose of restoring to his ally any delegated power in Scotland.

ROBERT THE STEWART AGAIN BECOMES REGENT (1346 A.D.)

Upon this, however, as well as other occasions of imminent peril, the Scottish people, on the very brink of ruin as an independent nation, found a remedy in their own dauntless courage. The nobility who had escaped from the field of Neville's Cross restored the Stewart of Scotland, heir of the crown, to the regency of the kingdom, in place of the imprisoned king. Yielding up the southern provinces, which he could not defend, the Stewart placed the country north of the Forth in as strong a posture as he could, and amid terror and disturbance maintained a show of government and good order. At this critical period William Lord Douglas returned from France, where he had been bred to arms, and, with the active valour of his uncle, the good Lord James, expelled the English invaders from his own domains of Douglasdale, and in process of time from Ettrick Forest and Teviotdale, provinces

[1346-1355 A.D.]

of which the warlike population had been long followers of this chivalrous family.

The consequences of these successes would probably have been a furious invasion of Scotland, had it depended entirely upon the will of Edward III. But the consent of the English barons was necessary, and they were little disposed to aid in a renewal of those expensive and destructive hostilities which had been so often and so fruitlessly waged against Scotland. The king of England, therefore, reluctantly consented to a truce with the Stewart, which he renewed from time to time, as he began to conceive designs of at once filling his coffers with a large ransom for his royal prisoner, David, and to secure a right of succession to the Scottish throne by other means than open war. With this view, the royal captive was treated with more kindness than at first, and (to sharpen, perhaps, his appetite for restoration to freedom and to his kingdom) he was allowed to visit Scotland on making oath and finding hostages to return in a time limited.

Impatient as his predecessor, William the Lion, David seems to have been ready to submit his kingdom to the sovereignty of Edward, and yield up once more the question of supremacy, in order to obtain his personal freedom. He appears even to have taken some steps for that purpose. But when the pulse of the Scottish nobles was sounded on this subject, they made an unanimous declaration, that though they would joyfully impoverish themselves to purchase with money the freedom of their sovereign, they would never agree to surrender, for that or any other object, the independence of their country. David was, therefore, obliged to return to his captivity.

A treaty for the ransom of David was eventually agreed upon by commissioners at Newcastle, for 90,000 marks sterling, which sum was to be paid up by instalments of 10,000 marks yearly. All the nobility of the kingdom, and all the merchants, were to become bound for the regular payment of these large sums. The greater part of the Scottish nobles thought this an exorbitant demand for the liberty of a prince of moderate talents, without heirs of his body, and attached to idle pleasures. While the estates were doubting whether or not the treaty should be ratified, the arrival of a brave French knight, de Garencière (or Garancières), with a small but selected body of knights and esquires, and a large sum of 40,000 *moulons* of gold, to be distributed among the Scots nobles on condition of their breaking the truce and invading England, decided their resolution. They readily adopted, at whatever future risk, the course which was attended with receiving money instead of that which involved their own paying it. Indeed, the Northumbrian borderers themselves made the first aggression, by invading and spoiling the lands of the earl of March. The Douglas and the earl of March determined on reprisals.

These Scottish nobles conducted their inroad as men well acquainted with the stratagems of border warfare.¹ The earls of Angus and March, assisted by the French auxiliaries, made themselves masters of the important town of Berwick, but failed to obtain possession of the castle. At this important crisis, the French, who had done various feats of arms under Eugene de Garencière, took their leave and returned home, disgusted with the service in Scotland.² Their national valour induced them to face with readiness the dangers of the warfare; but their manners and habits made them impatient of the rough fare and fierce manners of their allies.

[¹ Sir William Ramsay captured Sir Thomas Gray in an ambush at Nisbet.]

[² Froissart^{*} gives at length their vivid impressions of the contrast of the rude north with the courtly luxuries to which they were accustomed.]

THE LAST OF THE BALIOLS SURRENDERS THE CROWN TO EDWARD III
(1356 A.D.)

Edward III no sooner heard of the defeat at Nisbet and the surprise of Berwick, than he passed over from Calais, and appeared before the town with a great part of that veteran army which had been so often victorious in France, and large reinforcements, who emulated their valour. The Scots who had gained the town had had no time to store themselves with provisions, or make other preparations for defence. They capitulated, therefore, for permission to evacuate the town, of which Edward obtained possession by the terror of his appearance alone.

Berwick regained, it was now the object of Edward III to march into Scotland, and to put a final end to the interruptions which the Scottish wars so repeatedly offered to his operations in France. He determined, being now in possession of all means supposed adequate to the purpose, to make a final conquest of the kingdom, and forcibly unite it, as his grandfather had joined Wales, to the larger and richer portion of the island.

But as, like that grandfather, Edward III had not leisure to conquer kingdoms for other men, it was necessary for him to clear the way of the claims of Baliol, whom he had hitherto professed to regard as the legitimate king of Scotland. This was easily arranged, for Edward Baliol was, in the hands of Edward III, a far more flexible tool than his father had proved in those of Edward I. Being a mere phantom, whom Edward could summon upon the scene and dismiss at pleasure, he was probably very easily moulded to the purpose of the king of England, and of free consent and good-will underwent the ceremony of degradation to which his father, after failing in all attempts at resistance, had been compelled to submit, and which procured him the dishonourable nickname of Toom Tabard, or Empty Jacket. Edward Baliol appeared before Edward at Roxburgh attired in all the symbols of royalty, of which he formally divested himself, and laying his golden crown at the feet of the English king, ceded to him all right, title, and interest which he had or might claim in the sovereignty of Scotland. In guerdon of his pliancy, Baliol, when retiring into private life, was to be endowed by Edward III with a sum of 5,000 marks, and a stipend or annuity of 2,000 pounds sterling a year. With this splendid income Edward Baliol retired into privacy and obscurity, and is never again mentioned in history. The spirit of enterprise which dictated the invasion of Scotland in 1332 and the adventurous attack upon the Scottish encampment at Dupplin Muir, shows itself in no other part of his conduct. He died childless in the year 1363; and thus ended in his person the line of Baliol, whose pretensions had cost Scotland so dear.

EDWARD'S FUTILE INVASION (1356 A.D.)

The campaign which Edward designed should be decisive of the fate of Scotland now approached. The Scottish nobles, more wise in calamity than success, resolved to practise the lessons of defensive war which had been bequeathed to them by their deliverer, King Robert.

Edward no sooner entered Scotland than he found his troops in want of every species of supply, save what they bore along with them. Incensed at the difficulties and privations by which he was surrounded, Edward vented his wrath in reckless and indiscriminate destruction, burning every town and village which he approached, without sparing the edifices which were dedi-

[1266-1257 A.D.]

cated to heaven and holy uses. The fine abbey church at Haddington, called the Lamp of Lothian, from the beauty of its architecture, was burned down, and the monastery, as well as the town itself, utterly destroyed. These ravages caused the period (February, 1256) to be long remembered by the title of the Burnt Candlemas.

Edward had expected to meet his victualling ships, which had been despatched to Berwick; but no sail appeared on the shipless seas. After waiting ten days among the ruins of Haddington, his difficulties increasing with every minute, Edward at length learned that a storm had dispersed his fleet, not one of which had been able to enter the firth of Forth. Retreat was now inevitable: the sufferings of the English soldiers rendered it disorderly, and it was attended with proportional loss. The Scots, from mountains, dingles, forests, and pathless wildernesses, approached the English army on every side, watching it as the carrion crows and ravens wait on a tainted flock, to destroy such as fall down through weakness. To avoid returning through the wasted province of Berwickshire, Edward involved himself in the defiles of the upper part of Teviotdale and Ettrick Forest, where he suffered much loss from the harassing attacks of Douglas, and on one occasion very narrowly escaped being made prisoner.

DAVID II RETURNS FROM CAPTIVITY (1257 A.D.)

The failure of this great enterprise, the fifth in which the attempt of invasion had been foiled, seems to have induced Edward to resort to other means than those of open and avowed hostility for the establishment of his power in Scotland, an object which he conceived to be still within his reach. The temper of his royal prisoner David Bruce was now, by his long confinement in England, become well known to him, and he doubted not that by some agreement with the selfish prince he might secure that interest in Scotland and its government of which the people were so jealous. A preliminary step to such an intrigue was the delivery of David from his long captivity, and the establishment of peace between the nations. By the final agreement at Berwick between the commissioners for each kingdom, October 3rd, 1257, David's ransom, augmented since the last treaty, was fixed at 100,000 marks, to be discharged by partial payments of 10,000 marks yearly. The nobles, churchmen, and burgesses of Scotland bound themselves to see the instalments regularly paid; and three nobles of the highest rank, who might, however, be exchanged for others of the same degree from time to time, together with twenty young men of quality, the son of the Stewart being included, were surrendered to England as hostages. Thus was David restored to freedom eleven years after having been made prisoner at the battle of Neville's Cross. The terms, on the whole, were rather more severe than those proposed three years before, when the treaty was broken off by the interest of France.

The first thing, after his return, which marked the tendency of David's political feelings and attachments was his predilection for visits to England, and long residences there, which became so frequent as to excite a feeling among his subjects that they did but waste their substance in needlessly ransoming a sovereign who preferred the land of his captivity to his own dominions. A trifling incident also occurred soon after his liberation, which manifested an arrogant, vain, and unfeeling temper. As the people, eager to see their long-absent king, pressed into his presence with more affection than reverence, David snatched a mace from an attendant, and laying about

[1357-1363 A.D.]

him with his own royal hand, taught his liege subjects in future to put their loyal feelings under more ceremonial restraint.^g

Meanwhile, under this change of measures Scotland gradually improved, and the people, unconscious of the hidden designs which threatened to bring her down to the level of a province of England, enjoyed the benefits and blessings of peace. The country presented a stirring and busy scene. Merchants from Perth, Aberdeen, Kirkaldy, Edinburgh, and the various towns and royal burghs, commenced a lucrative trade with England, and through that country with Flanders, Zealand, France, and other parts of the continent; wool, hides, sheep and lamb skins, cargoes of fish, herds of cattle, horses, dogs of the chase, and falcons, were exported.

Frequent and numerous parties of rich merchants, with caravans laden with their goods, and attended by companies of horsemen and squires, for the purposes of defence and security, travelled from all parts of Scotland into England and the continent. Edward furnished them with passports, or safe-conducts; and the preservation of these instruments, amongst the Scottish rolls in the Tower, furnishes us with an authentic and curious picture of the commerce of the times. On one memorable occasion, in the space of a single month, a party of sixty-five merchants obtained safe-conducts to travel through England, for the purposes of trade; and their warlike suite amounted to no less than two hundred and thirty horsemen.

Besides this, the Scottish youth, and many scholars of more advanced years, crowded to the colleges of England; numerous parties of pilgrims travelled to the various shrines of saints and martyrs, and were liberally welcomed and protected; whilst, in those Scottish districts which were still in the hands of the English, Edward, by preserving to the inhabitants their ancient customs and privileges, endeavoured to overcome the national antipathy and conciliate the affections of the people. Commissions were granted to his various officers in Scotland, empowering them to receive the homage and adherence of the Scots who had hitherto refused to acknowledge his authority; passports, and all other means of indulgence and protection, were withdrawn from such as resisted or became objects of suspicion; and every means was taken to strengthen the few castles which he possessed.^h

The weakness of David, who had shown himself willing, would his subjects have permitted him, to sacrifice to Edward the independence of Scotland, by acknowledging him as lord paramount, had encouraged the king of England to propose that, in place of the Stewart of Scotland, the grandson of Robert Bruce by his daughter Marjory, Lionel duke of Clarence, the third son of Edward III himself, should be called to succeed to the crown of Scotland. This project seems to have been kept closely concealed from the Scottish nation at large until the month of March, 1363, when David Bruce ventured to bring it himself before the estates of the Scottish parliament, convoked to meet at Scone. The king of Scotland had lately become a widower, by the death of Queen Joanna, during one of her visits to England.

David Bruce proposed to the estates of Scotland, "that, in the event of his dying without heirs, they should settle the crown on one of the sons of the king of England. He particularly recommended the duke Lionel of Clarence as a worthy object of their choice, hinted that this would insure a constant peace between the two nations of Britain, and become the means to induce the king of England to resign, formally and forever, all pretensions to the feudal supremacy, which had been the cause of such fatal struggles."

The estates of Scotland listened with sorrow and indignation to such a proposition, coming as it did from the lips of their sovereign, the son of the

[1363-1368 A.D.]

heroic Robert Bruce. Instantly and unanimously they replied, "that they would never permit an Englishman to rule over them; that, by solemn acts of settlement sworn to in parliament, the Stewart of Scotland was called to the crown in default of the present king or issue of his body; that he was a brave man, and worthy of the succession: from which, therefore, they refused to exclude him, by preferring the son of an alien enemy."

King David received, doubtless, this blunt refusal, which necessarily inferred a severe personal reproach, with shame and mortification, but made no reply; and the parliament, passing to other matters, appointed commissioners to labour at the great work of converting the present precarious truce between England and Scotland into a steady and permanent peace. But the proposal of altering the destination of the crown, although apparently passed from or withdrawn, remained tenaciously rooted in the minds of those whose interests had been assailed by it. The Stewart and his sons, with many of his kindred, the earls of March, Douglas, and other southern barons, assumed arms, and entered into bonds or leagues to prevent, they said, the alteration of the order of succession as fixed in the days of Bruce. The king armed in his turn, not, as he alleged, to enforce an alteration of the succession, but to restore good order, and compel the associated lords to lay down their arms, in which he was successful. The Stewart and his associates submitted themselves, awed by the unexpected spirit displayed by the king, and the numerous party which continued to adhere to him. Stewart himself, together with Douglas, March, and others associated in the league, were contented to renounce the obligation in open parliament, convened at Inchmurdoch, May 14th, 1363. The Stewart, upon the same occasion, swore on the gospels true liegdom and fealty to David, under the penalty of forfeiting not only his own life and lands, but his and his family's title of succession to the throne. In recompense of this prompt return to the duty of a subject, as well as to soothe the apprehensions for national independence which the proposal of the king had excited, the right of succession to the throne, as solemnly established in the Stewart and his sons, was fully recognised, and the earldom of Carrick, once a title of Robert Bruce, was conferred on his eldest son, afterwards Robert III.

THE KING'S RANSOM, AND EDWARD'S EFFORTS AT A PEACEFUL CONQUEST OF SCOTLAND

The imprudent David had hardly ratified the proceedings of the parliament of Scone ere, forgetful of the danger he had lately incurred, he repaired to London, and renewed with Edward III those intrigues which had for their object the alteration of the succession. A new plan was now drawn up for this purpose, at a conference held between the two kings and certain selected counsellors, November 23rd, 1363. By this the king of England, Edward III, was himself to be declared heir of King David, in case the former should die without male issue. Twenty-seven conditions followed, the object of most of which seems to have been to reconcile the Scottish people to the sway of an English monarch, by imparting to them a share in the advantages of English trade, by ratifying to north Britain its laws and independence as a separate kingdom, and, above all, by discharging the ransom, which continued a heavy burden upon Scotland, of which only a tenth part had been yet paid. The national pride was to be flattered by the restoration of the fatal stone of inauguration, on which it was proposed that the king of England himself should be crowned at Scone, after the Scottish manner. All claim of suprem-

acy was to be renounced, and the independence of Scotland, in church and state, was carefully provided for, together with an obligation on Edward, when he should succeed to the throne, binding him to use Scottish counsellors in all the national concerns of the kingdom, and to employ native Scotsmen in all offices of trust.

But the same schedule of articles contains a clause for giving the English king the command of the Scottish national and feudal levies; a condition which alone must have had the consequence of placing the country at Edward's unlimited disposal. The minutes of this conference open with a provision of strict secrecy, and a declaration that what follows is not to be considered as anything finally resolved upon or determined, but merely as the heads of a plan to be hereafter examined more maturely, and adopted, altered, or altogether thrown aside at pleasure. By the last article the king of Scotland undertook to sound the inclinations of his people respecting this scheme, and report the result to the English king within fifteen days after Easter. It is probable that David, on his return to Scotland, found the scheme totally impracticable.

A circumstance of personal imprudence now added to the difficulties by which King David was surrounded. With a violence unbecoming his high rank and mature age he fell in love with a beautiful young woman, called Margaret Logie, daughter of Sir John Logie, executed for accession to that plot against Robert Bruce which was prosecuted and punished in the times of the Black Parliament. The young lady was eminently beautiful; and the king, finding he could not satisfy his passion otherwise, gave her his hand in marriage, 1364. This unequal alliance scandalised his haughty nobles, and seems to have caused an open rupture betwixt David and his kinsman the Stewart, whose views to the crown were placed in danger of being disappointed, if the fair lady should bear a son to her royal husband. It was probably on account of some quarrel arising out of this subject of discord that King David seems to have thrown the Stewart with his son, the lord of Badenoch, into prison, where both were long detained.

The accomplishment of a general and enduring peace betwixt the two kingdoms was now the occupation of commissioners. The payment of the ransom of David was the principal obstacle. The first instalments had been discharged with tolerable regularity. For this effect the Scottish parliament had made great sacrifices. The whole wool of the kingdom, apparently its most productive subject of export, was directed to be delivered up to the king at a low rate [four marks a sack], and the surplus produced over prime cost in disposing of the commodity to the foreign merchants in Flanders was to be applied in discharge of the ransom. A property tax upon men of every degree was also imposed and levied. From these funds the sum of 20,000 marks had been raised and paid to England. But since these payments the destined sources had fallen short. The Scots had applied to the pope, who having already granted to the king a tenth of the ecclesiastical benefices for the term of three years, refused to authorise any further tax upon the clergy. They solicited France, who, as her own king was unransomed and in captivity in England, had a fair apology for declining further assistance, unless under condition that the Scots would resume the war with England, in which case they promised a contribution of 50,000 marks towards the ransom of King David.

Scotland being thus straitened and without resources, the stipulated instalments of the ransom necessarily fell into arrear, and heavy penalties were, according to the terms of the treaty, incurred for default of payment. Ed-

[1305-1371 A.D.]

ward acted the part of a lenient creditor. He was less intent on payment of the ransom than to place the Scottish nation in so insolvent a condition that the estates might be glad, in one way or other, to compromise that debt by a sacrifice of their independence. The penalties and arrears were now computed to amount to 100,000 pounds, to be paid by instalments of 6,000 marks yearly. The truce was prolonged for about three years. These payments, though most severe on the nation of Scotland, seem to have been made good with regularity by means of the taxes which the Scottish parliament had imposed for defraying them: so that in 1369 the truce between the nations was continued for fourteen years, and the English conceded that the balance of the ransom, amounting still to 56,000 marks, should be cleared by annual payments of 4,000 marks. In this manner the ransom of David was completely discharged, and a receipt in full was granted by Richard II in the seventh year of his reign. These heavy but necessary exactions were not made without internal struggles and insurrections.

DAVID DIVORCES HIS WIFE; HIS DEATH (1371 A.D.)

Family discord broke out in the royal family. Margaret Logie, the young and beautiful queen, was expensive, like persons who are suddenly removed from narrow to opulent circumstances. David's passion was satiated, and he was desirous of dissolving the unequal marriage which he had so imprudently formed. The bishops of Scotland pronounced a sentence of divorce, but upon what grounds we are left ignorant by historians. Margaret Logie appealed to the pope from the sentence of the Scottish church, and went to Avignon to prosecute the cause by means of such wealth as she had amassed during her continuance in power, which is said to have been considerable. Her appeal was heard with favour by the pope in 1369; but she did not live to bring it to an issue, as she died abroad. After the divorce of this lady by the Scottish prelates the Stewart and his son were released from prison and restored to the king's favour, which plainly showed by what influence they had incurred disgrace and captivity.

Little more remains to be said of David II. He became affected with a mortal illness, and died in the castle of Edinburgh, February 22nd, 1371, at the early age of forty-seven, and in the forty-fifth year of his reign. He had courage, affability, and the external graces which become a prince. But his life was an uniform contrast to the patriotic devotion of his father. He exacted and received the most painful sacrifices at the hands of his subjects, and never curbed himself in a single caprice, or denied himself a single indulgence, in requital of their loyalty and affection. In the latter years of his life he acted as the dishonourable tool of England, and was sufficiently willing to have exchanged, for paltry and personal advantages, the independence of Scotland, bought by his heroic father at the expense of so many sufferings, which terminated in ruined health and premature death.

PROGRESS OF THE COUNTRY AT THIS PERIOD

The reign of David II was as melancholy a contrast to that of his father as that of Robert I had been brilliant when contrasted with his predecessors. Yet we recognise in it a nearer approach to civil polity, and a more absolute commixture of the different tribes by which Scotland was peopled into one general nation, obedient to a single government. Even the chiefs of the Isles and Highlands were so much subdued as to own the allegiance of the Scottish

[1368-1371 A.D.]

king, to hold seats in his parliaments, and resign, though reluctantly, much of that rude and tumultuous independence which they had formerly made their boast. Still the separation of the Highlands from the Lowlands was that betwixt two separate races. A few great families can trace their descent from the period of Robert Bruce; but a far greater number are first distinguished in the reign of his son, where the lists of the battle of Durham contain the names of the principal nobility and gentry in modern Scotland, and are the frequent resource of the genealogists. The spirit of commerce advanced in the time of David I against all the disadvantages of foreign and domestic warfare.

In the parliaments of 1368 and 1369 a practice was introduced, for the first time apparently, of empowering committees of parliament to prepare and arrange, in previous and secret meetings, the affairs of delicacy and importance which were afterwards to come before the body at large. As this led to investing a small cabal of the representatives with the exclusive power of garbling and selecting the subjects for parliamentary debate, it necessarily tended to limit the free discussion so essential to the constitution of that body, and finally assumed the form of that very obnoxious institution called Lords of the Articles, who, claiming the preliminary right of examining and rejecting at their pleasure such measures as were to be brought before parliament, became a severe restraint on national freedom.

Amidst pestilence and famine, which made repeated ravages in Scotland during this unhappy reign, the Scottish national spirit never showed itself more energetically determined on resisting the English domination to the last. Particular chiefs and nobles were no doubt seduced from their allegiance, but there was no general or undisturbed pause of submission and apathy. The nation was strong in its very weakness; for as the Scots became unequal to the task of assembling national armies, they were saved from the consequences of such general actions as Dunbar, Halidon, and Berwick, and obliged to limit themselves to the defensive species of war, best suited to the character of the country, and that which its inhabitants were so well qualified to wage.

The Scottish parliament seems never to have failed in perceiving the evils which afflicted the state, or in making sound and sagacious regulations to repress them; but unhappily the executive power 'seldom or never possessed the authority necessary to enforce the laws; and thus the nation continued in the condition of a froward patient, who cannot be cured because there is no prevailing upon him to take the prescriptions ordered by the physicians.

[¹ Nevertheless, as Hume Brown ⁴ emphasises, parliament considerably encroached on the king's prerogative, regulating coinage treaties, and even the king's privy purse.]



CHAPTER VII

THE ACCESSION OF THE STUARTS

[1271-1294 A.D.]

A permanent English conquest of Scotland has always proved impossible, because the Scots as a people have ever shown themselves, even when vanquished in the field, worthy of freedom. In this sense their long history has demonstrated that they belong to the elect among the nations, the stream of whose national life is fed from the deep fount of strong character and ardent sentiment.—
JAMES MACKINNON.⁵

THE death of David II had threatened for a moment to involve the kingdom in a civil war. The earl of Douglas, who was at that time at Linlithgow, suddenly proclaimed his own title to the throne, and announced his intention of opposing the claim of the acknowledged heir, the Stewart of Scotland. This powerful and turbulent baron pretended to unite in his own person the claims of Comyn and Baliol, and some offence which had been given him by the party of the Stewart seems to have driven him into this hasty demonstration. But Sir Robert Erskine, who had the command of the castles of Edinburgh, Stirling, and Dumbarton, marched against him without delay, and was joined on his way by the earls of March and Moray; and their united force was too great to allow the pretender any hope of success from an appeal to arms. Douglas met his opponents in a peaceful conference, and he declared himself satisfied by their arguments of the emptiness of his own title and of the justice of that of the Stewart. In reward for his prompt submission the Stewart's daughter, Isabella, was promised in marriage to Douglas's son, with an annual pension. Douglas himself was appointed king's justiciar on the south of the Forth and warden of the east marches.

A few well-applied gifts to those who had come forward so zealously to support the Stewart's title to the throne cleared away all further opposition, and he was crowned in the abbey of Scone, in great pomp and splendour,

[1371 A.D.]

on March 26th, 1371, and proclaimed as King Robert II. After the usual oaths of homage had been taken, the new king stood up and declared his eldest son, John, earl of Carrick and Stewart of Scotland, heir to the throne in the event of his own death, and this nomination was approved by the whole assembled multitude, clergy and laity.

Thus did the crown of Scotland pass into a new race, for Robert derived royal blood only through his mother, the daughter of Robert Bruce. He was descended in the direct line from a branch of the Anglo-Norman family of the Fitz-Alans, who had left England to settle in Scotland in the twelfth century. Walter Fitz-Alan held the high office of Stewart of the king's household in the reign of David I, and the dignity having been made hereditary in the family, the title was at length converted into a surname, and thus originated the family of Stewart, or, as the name of the royal race is more usually spelled, Stuart.

The power of this house had been strengthened by numerous and powerful alliances. Robert Stuart who now ascended the throne had been twice married. By his first wife he had four sons, John, earl of Carrick; Walter, earl of Fife; Robert, earl of Menteith, and Alexander, earl of Buchan; and six daughters, all married into the most powerful families in Scotland. By his second wife he had two sons, David, earl of Strathearn, and Walter, earl of Athol, and four daughters, the eldest of whom was subsequently married to James, earl of Douglas, and the other three were wedded into houses little less powerful. He had also eight natural sons, who also ranked among the nobility of the land, and lent their support to his throne.

Robert II thus succeeded to a kingdom involved in great embarrassments, at an age (fifty-five) when he was already approaching the decline of life, and when the energy of his youth had given place to a love of peace and inactivity. This disadvantage, however, was balanced by his long experience in Scottish state affairs, and by the support of a numerous family; and his gentle and affable manners rendered him generally popular among his subjects, though he had not always the strength or influence to repress their turbulence. Fortunately, however, neither England nor Scotland was at this moment in a condition to wish for war. The former was gradually losing the possessions in France which had been secured by Edward's victories during the earlier part of his reign; and the heavy taxes which the wars in which he was already engaged required, joined with his own feeble health, made it necessary to avoid any measures that would call for new exertions. In addition to the other disadvantages of her position Scotland was suffering from a famine of such a severe character that its population was supported entirely on grain imported from England and Ireland.

Still it was difficult to keep the turbulent borders on either side in peace, and events occurred, in spite of all the precautions of the respective governments, which ended in a war between the two kingdoms, and soon open acts of the governments themselves showed but too clearly the feeling of national hostility which lurked beneath their peaceful professions. October 28th, 1371, a new treaty of amity was entered into between Scotland and France, in which the two powers engaged to support each other against their common enemy, England. About the same time great offence was given to the Scots by the omission of the title of king in the usual receipt for the payment of the ransom-money, which was looked upon as a proof that Edward still harboured designs against the national independence of Scotland.

In spite of these occurrences, the two countries remained at peace during several years, which were employed by King Robert in strengthening his

[1371-1377 A.D.]

family in the possession of the throne, in regulating the expenses of the royal household, and in introducing substantial reforms into the administration of justice. These objects constituted the main business of two parliaments held in March, 1371, and April, 1373. Little else occurred to arrest the pen of the historian until the death of Edward III of England, which occurred on June 1st, 1377. This event tended to increase the chances of peace between the two kingdoms, and there can be little doubt that the wishes of the two governments were directed towards a friendly alliance. But in Scotland, at least, the king had at this time but a precarious power over his subjects.

THE TURBULENT NOBILITY AND THE BORDER FEUDS

During the troubles which had torn the kingdom to pieces since the death of Robert Bruce, the nobles had been increasing in power and turbulence, and many of them had individually the force and the will to involve their country in hostilities whenever it suited their interests or gratified their revenge. The latter feeling gave rise, soon after the accession of Richard II to the English throne, to an outrage of a very atrocious character. The castle of Roxburgh was held by an English garrison, and the town was much frequented at this time by Englishmen. There was held at Roxburgh a rather celebrated fair on the feast of St. Lawrence, August 10th. At this fair, in 1376, one of the retainers of the earl of March was slain by some Englishmen in one of the brawls so frequent on such occasions. The earl, who was one of the most powerful and turbulent of the Scottish nobles, demanded satisfaction from the garrison, with a threat that if it was not given, he, individually, would no longer respect the truce. The threat and demand were slighted, and a whole year passed by without any further notice being taken of the matter. At length the fair of St. Lawrence came round again, and English merchants and traders crowded into the town, and took up their lodgings without suspicion of treachery. But, early in the morning of the fair, the earl of March attacked the town with a strong armed force, and set fire to it. The English were dragged from their houses and booths and murdered without respect of age or sex, or burned in their dwellings, and, after collecting a rich booty, the earl marched off with his men as though he had performed a legitimate act of war.

The English borderers, provoked at the atrocity of this attack, flew to arms and ravaged the lands of Sir John Gordon, a baron of the earl of March's party, who had been very prominent in the massacre at Roxburgh. Gordon retaliated by collecting his vassals, and making a raid into England, from whence he returned with a large booty in cattle and prisoners. He was intercepted in his retreat by an English borderer, Sir John Lilburne, with a superior force, and an obstinate engagement took place in a mountain-pass, which ended in the defeat of the English. Sir John Gordon was himself seriously wounded, but he secured his booty, and carried off Sir John Lilburne as his prisoner. Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, the warden of the English marches, incensed at this breach of the truce, raised an army of seven thousand men, and entered the possessions of the earl of March with the resolution of taking exemplary vengeance on the turbulent Scot.

But while he lay encamped near Duns, in Berwickshire, a trick was played upon his army which threw ridicule upon the expedition. In the dead of night the English camp was surrounded by a tumultuous rabble of Scots, armed with rattles used by the peasantry to drive wild beasts away from their flocks, and with these and a horrible mixture of discordant yells and

[1377-1383 A.D.]

shouts, they threw the English into the utmost terror and confusion. The English force consisted chiefly of knights and men-at-arms, who had slept on their arms, leaving their horses picketed round the outside of the camp, in the care of their valets and camp-boys. The men stood to their arms and prepared to resist an attack, but the horses, terrified at the noise, broke loose and ran wild over the plain, whence most of them were carried off by the Scots. When daybreak at last appeared no enemy was visible, and the English soon discovered the stratagem by which they had been alarmed, and the loss of their horses. Angry and mortified, they were obliged to return into England on foot, though they first pillaged the lands of the earl of March, and carried away a considerable booty.

The same hostilities were carried on by the Scots on the western borders, and a piratical fleet of Scottish, French, and Spanish ships, under a Scottish adventurer named Mercer, infested the seas. The Scottish government was too feeble to restrain these outrages, and that of England was at this moment wanting in the energy to resist them. It was left to an English merchant named Philpot to fit out a fleet at his own expense, with which he encountered and destroyed or captured the whole of Mercer's armament. Among these were fifteen Spanish vessels and a considerable number of rich prizes.

The hostilities continued unchecked, and at length a party of adventurers, under Alexander Ramsay, surprised and captured the castle of Berwick. The earl of Northumberland, with a force of ten thousand men, laid siege to the castle, which was taken after an obstinate defence, in which Ramsay and his handful of borderers for some length of time held the whole English army at bay. This event occurred in the year 1378. When the castle of Berwick was reduced, the earl of Northumberland marched with his army into Scotland to ravage the southern districts, where the lands of the hostile borderers lay. As they advanced, Sir Archibald Douglas, lord of Galloway, with a considerable force, though quite unequal to that of the English earl, encountered Sir Thomas Musgrave with an advanced party of English at Melrose, and after a short but obstinate engagement defeated them, taking Musgrave and his son, with many knights and other prisoners. Douglas then fell back upon Edinburgh, and the Percy, when he had done all the mischief he could, returned to England.

The following year presented a repetition of the same scenes of slaughter and devastation, until at length, in 1380, John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, whose influence at this time ruled England, marched to Scotland at the head of a powerful army, with the declared object of establishing peace and good order between the two countries. A cessation of hostilities having been agreed to, the duke disbanded his army and soon afterwards a conference was held between him and the earl of Carrick, the next heir to the Scottish throne, which ended in the renewal of the truce for three years.

On the expiration of the truce in 1383, the Scots recommenced hostilities, and Sir Archibald Douglas captured the castle of Lochmaberry, which had remained in the hands of the English. On the other hand, the duke of Lancaster, with a numerous army, marched into Scotland, and a fleet of victualing ships attended on his progress. But they found that the Scots had completely cleared the country of everything movable, and the English soldiers in a wasted country, with an unusually severe season (it was the month of March), suffered greatly. The system of warfare so strongly recommended by Robert Bruce was thus successful under his son-in-law; the English army was obliged by its necessities to retreat. The borders, however, continued to be the scene of hostilities.

[1385 A.D.]

JOHN DE VIENNE AND THE FRENCH ALLIES IN SCOTLAND

While affairs were in this state in Scotland, a new element of hostility was in preparation abroad to plunge the Scots into a war with England. The government of France, after some reflection, determined to put in force the late treaty with the Scots, by sending an army into Scotland to invade England from the north. John de Vienne, admiral of France, and one of the most experienced captains of the age, was chosen to command this expedition, and he carried over into Scotland a thousand knights, esquires, and men-at-arms, the flower of the French army, with about the same number of cross-bow men and common soldiers. John de Vienne and his small but brilliant army came to anchor in the ports of Leith and Dunbar in the May of 1385. They were received with great joy by the Scottish nobles, who shared in a liberal distribution of French gold and of foreign armour, for the French commander had brought with him fourteen hundred suits of the latter and 50,000 francs of gold. On their arrival at Edinburgh the king was absent



KILCHURN CASTLE, ARGYLLSHIRE

in a distant part of the country, and they were received by the earls of Moray and Douglas. It was quite impossible to find room for them all in the capital, so that it was found necessary to seek lodgings in the villages around. Comforts were rare in Scotland at this time, and when the French knights, fresh from the luxurious hotels of Paris, found themselves billeted amid poverty and privations, it is not to be surprised if there was much murmuring and discontent. Nor were the complaints all on their side, for the people were prejudiced against the foreign language and the loose manners of their guests, who appropriated to themselves whatever they liked, and assumed an air of haughty superiority which was particularly disagreeable to the Scots. The lesser barons and the people soon quarrelled with these visitors, and did everything they could to give them annoyance.

The hostility increased to such a degree that their foraging parties were frequently cut off by the peasantry, so that more than a hundred men were slain in the space of a month. At length, after much reluctance on the part of the king, an army of thirty thousand horsemen was soon assembled in the neighbourhood of the capital.

It seems evident that King Robert was himself averse to the war, and his infirmities hindered him from being an eye-witness of its ravages. While he remained at Edinburgh, his sons, with the earls of Douglas, Moray, Mar,

and Sutherland, marched at the head of the army. The country was everywhere ravaged with fire and sword, and an accumulating mass of plunder and prisoners accompanied the march of the army as it proceeded by Alnwick to the gates of Newcastle. Here intelligence reached the Scottish leaders that the barons of England had assembled their forces and were marching rapidly against them. It had always been the policy of the Scots to avoid great battles, and they now prepared to retreat with their booty. The proud admiral of France was shocked at the Scottish mode of making war, and he urged strongly and vainly the earls of Douglas and Moray to remain where they were, and give battle to their opponents.

The English army pursued its devastating course through a country in which the inhabitants had left nothing to destroy except bare walls and green crops, and the churches and monasteries. Melrose and Dryburgh were delivered to the flames. Edinburgh itself was plundered and burned. The monastery of Holyrood was spared at the intercession of the duke of Lancaster, who had been hospitably lodged in it. Many other towns and villages were burned by the English army, which now began to run short of provisions. The duke of Lancaster recommended the bold but somewhat perilous measure of passing the Forth and leading the army into the northern provinces which had not been stripped by the Scots, but the king was so much alarmed at this proposal that he accused his uncle of treasonable motives in suggesting it. It only now remained for the English army to retreat, and as usual they experienced the inevitable consequence of the destruction which had attended their progress. Multitudes of the soldiers died on their way home from the hardships and privations they endured in a country utterly stripped and wasted.

Meanwhile the army under Douglas and the admiral had not been idle. Instead of following the English army, they turned off into the western marches, and there, joined by the forces of Sir Archibald Douglas, they overran and ravaged Cumberland with dreadful ferocity. After having laid waste the lands of the principal border barons, they made an attack upon Carlisle, but were beaten off with loss. The jealousies between the Scots and their foreign allies now broke out anew, and with an increase of bitterness. Most of the French knights were anxious to depart, for they were by this time reduced to a wretched condition by sickness and privation, and they were nearly all without horses, so that it would have been dangerous to provoke their hosts too far. The admiral, accordingly, entered into an agreement, by which he bound himself to discharge all claims of damage and reparation which were made against his soldiers, and not to leave the country himself till they were fully satisfied. The French knights were thus allowed to depart, and Froissart^c quaintly informs us that "divers knights and squires had passage and returned into Flanders, as wind and weather drove them, with neither horse nor harness, right poor and feeble, cursing the day that ever they came upon such an adventure, and fervently desiring that the kings of France and England would conclude a peace for a year or two, were it only to have the satisfaction of uniting their armies and utterly destroying the realm of Scotland." John de Vienne himself discharged his responsibilities as quickly as possible, and returned to France. Thus ended an expedition on the great effects of which the French reckoned so much, and were grievously disappointed.

Hostilities continued to be carried on with great animosity. The government of Richard II became weaker and weaker, and no combined measures were taken to suppress the inroads of the Scots, who began systematically

[1385-1388 A.D.]

to ravage the English counties on the border. The booty that was thus successively carried off from the English territory was immense.

In the resolution of the Scots to carry on the war, the wishes of King Robert had again been overruled by his nobles. It was decided at a council held in Edinburgh that the whole military force of the kingdom should be mustered at Jedburgh, in order to invade England on an extensive scale. The king's eldest son, the earl of Carrick, was feeble of body, and apparently not very strong of mind, and his next brother, the earl of Fife, was appointed to command in this important expedition. On the day appointed for the muster, the Scottish army assembled at Yetholm, a small town at the foot of the Cheviot hills, about twelve miles from Jedburgh. It consisted of twelve hundred men-at-arms and forty thousand infantry, including a small body of archers, forming together such a force as had not been gathered together in Scotland for a long time. The earl of Fife determined to separate his force, and while one division, commanded by himself, marched through Liddesdale, the smaller division, commanded by the earl of Douglas, was directed to invade the eastern marches.

Another expedition at this moment occupied another of the Douglasses, Sir Archibald, popularly known as the Black Douglas, the natural son of Sir Archibald of Galloway, a man of great celebrity among the Scots for his strength and valour in war, as well as for his gentleness and courtesy in time of peace. He had married one of the king's daughters, Egidia, who was as much celebrated for her beauty, as her husband was renowned for his warlike qualities. The Black Douglas had been provoked by the piracies of the Irish shipping on the coast of Galloway, and with five hundred lances he made a retaliatory descent on the Irish coast, at Carlingford. On their return from this successful expedition, Douglas took horse and rode in all haste to join the army which had crossed the English border.

Meanwhile the earl of Douglas, passing the Tyne, had thrown himself into the heart of the bishopric of Durham before any one was aware of his approach. There the Scots began immediately their usual course of devastation, and burned and slew without opposition over the whole country between Durham and Newcastle, and then led their army before the latter town. The English barons on the border had been completely surprised by this sudden invasion, and in the uncertainty in which the capture of one of their spies had left them they imagined that the small army under Douglas was only the van of the Scottish forces, which they supposed were following after, and they were therefore more cautious in their movements. On the first intimation of danger the earl of Northumberland began to collect a force at Alnwick, and sent his two sons, Henry [called Hotspur] and Ralph Percy, to Newcastle, where they had assembled the principal gentry of Yorkshire. Froissart,^c who had received his information from men of both sides who were present, gives a detailed and interesting account of the events which followed, and which forms one of the most chivalrous episodes of the wars of this turbulent age.^d

FROISSART'S ACCOUNT OF OTTERBURN OR CHEVY CHACE (1388 A.D.)

The Scots lords, having completed the object of their expedition into Durham, lay before Newcastle three days, where there was an almost continual skirmish. The sons of the earl of Northumberland, from their great courage, were always the first at the barriers, when many valiant deeds were done with lances hand to hand. The earl of Douglas had a long conflict with

[1388 A.D.]

Sir Henry Percy, and in it, by gallantry of arms, won his pennon, to the great vexation of Sir Henry and the other English. The earl of Douglas said, "I will carry this token of your prowess with me to Scotland, and place it on the tower of my castle at Dalkeith, that it may be seen from far." "By God, Earl of Douglas," replied Sir Henry, "you shall not even bear it out of Northumberland; be assured you shall never have this pennon to brag of." "You must come then," answered Earl Douglas, "this night and seek for it. I will fix your pennon before my tent, and shall see if you will venture to take it away."

As it was now late the skirmish ended, and each party retired to their quarters, to disarm and comfort themselves. The Scots kept up a very strict watch, concluding, from the words of Sir Henry Percy, they should have their quarters beaten up this night: they were disappointed, for Sir Henry was advised to defer it.

On the morrow the Scots dislodged from before Newcastle; and, taking the road to their own country, they came to a town and castle called Pontclau [Pontland]. After they had burned the town and castle, they marched away for Otterburn, which was eight English leagues from Newcastle, and there encamped themselves. [While they delayed before this castle, the English learned that the Scots were not a vanguard, but were no more than three thousand all told.]

Sir Henry Percy, on hearing this, was greatly rejoiced, and cried out, "To horse! to horse! for by the faith I owe my God, and to my lord and father, I will seek to recover my pennon, and to beat up their quarters this night." Such knights and squires in Newcastle as learned this were willing to be of the party, and made themselves ready. He was accompanied by six hundred spears, of knights and squires, and upwards of eight thousand infantry, which he said would be more than enough to fight the Scots, who were but three hundred lances and two thousand others.

As the Scots were supping—some indeed were gone to sleep, for they had laboured hard during the day at the attack of the castle, and intended renewing it in the cool of the morning—the English arrived, and mistook, at their entrance, the huts of the servants for those of their masters. They forced their way into the camp, which was, however, tolerably strong, shouting out, "Percy! Percy!" In such cases you may suppose an alarm is soon given, and it was fortunate for the Scots the English had made their first attack on their servants' quarters, which checked them some little. The Scots, expecting the English, had prepared accordingly; for while the lords were arming themselves, they ordered a body of their infantry to join their servants and keep up the skirmish. As their men were armed, they formed themselves under the pennons of the three principal barons, who each had his particular appointment. In the mean time the night advanced, but it was sufficiently light; for the moon shone, and it was the month of August, when the weather is temperate and serene.

When the Scots were quite ready, and properly arrayed, they left their camp in silence, but did not march to meet the English. They skirted the side of a mountain which was hard by; for during the preceding day they had well examined the country around, and said among themselves, "Should the English come to beat up our quarters, we will do so and so," and thus settled their plans beforehand, which was the saving of them; for it is of the greatest advantage to men-at-arms, when attacked in the night, to have previously arranged their mode of defence, and well to have weighed the chance of victory or defeat. The English had soon overpowered the servants; but

[1566 A.D.]

as they advanced into the camp they found fresh bodies ready to oppose them and to continue the fight. The Scots, in the mean time, marched along the mountain side, and fell on the enemy's flank quite unexpectedly, shouting their cries. This was a great surprise to the English, who, however, formed themselves in better order, and reinforced that part of their army. The cries of Percy and Douglas resounded on each side.

I was made acquainted with all the particulars of this battle by knights and squires who had been actors in it on each side. In my youth I, the author of this history, travelled all through Scotland, and was full fifteen days resident with William earl of Douglas, father of Earl James, of whom we are now speaking, at his castle of Dalkeith, five miles distant from Edinburgh. Earl James was then very young, but a promising youth. I had my information, therefore, from both parties, who agree that it was the hardest and most obstinate battle that was ever fought.

The Death of Douglas: Prowess of Scots and English

The Scots behaved most valiantly, for the English were three to one. I do not mean to say the English did not acquit themselves well; for they would sooner be slain or made prisoners in battle than reproached with flight. The two banners of Douglas and Percy met, and the men-at-arms under each exerted themselves by every means to gain the victory; but the English, at this attack, were so much the stronger that the Scots were driven back. The earl of Douglas, who was of a high spirit, seeing his men repulsed, seized a battle-axe with both his hands, like a gallant knight, and, to rally his men, dashed into the midst of his enemies, and gave such blows on all around him that no one could withstand them, but all made way for him on every side; for there were none so well armed with helmets or plates but that they suffered from his battle-axe. Thus he advanced, like another Hector, thinking to recover and conquer the field, from his own prowess, until he was met by three spears that were pointed at him; one struck him on the shoulder, another on the stomach, near the belly, and the third entered his thigh. He could never disengage himself from these spears, but was borne to the ground fighting desperately. From that moment he never rose again. Some of his knights and squires had followed him, but not all; for, though the moon shone, it was rather dark. The three English lances knew they had struck down some person of considerable rank, but never thought it was Earl Douglas: had they known it, they would have been so rejoiced that their courage would have been redoubled, and the fortune of the day had consequently been determined to their side. The Scots were ignorant also of their loss until the battle was over, otherwise they would certainly, from despair, have been discomfited. I will relate what befell the earl afterward. As soon as he fell, his head was cleaved with a battle-axe, the spear thrust through his thigh, and the main body of the English marched over him without paying any attention, not supposing him to be their principal enemy. In another part of the field the earls of March and Dunbar combated valiantly; and the English gave the Scots full employment who had followed the earl of Douglas, and had engaged with the two Percies. The earl of Moray behaved so gallantly in pursuing the English that they knew not how to resist him.

Of all the battles that have been described in this history, great and small, this of which I am now speaking was the best fought and the most severe; for there was not a man, knight or squire, who did not acquit himself gallantly, hand to hand with this enemy. It resembled something that of Coche-

[1388 A.D.]

rel, which was as long and as hardily disputed. The sons of the earl of Northumberland, Sir Henry and Sir Ralph Percy, who were the leaders of this expedition, behaved themselves like good knights in the combat. Almost a similar accident befell Sir Ralph as that which happened to the earl of Douglas; for, having advanced too far, he was surrounded by the enemy and severely wounded, and, being out of breath, surrendered himself to a Scots knight, called Sir John Maxwell, who was under the command, and of the household, of the earl of Moray.

When made prisoner, the knight asked him who he was, for it was dark, and he knew him not. Sir Ralph was so weakened by loss of blood, which was flowing from his wound, that he could scarcely avow himself to be Sir Ralph Percy. "Well," replied the knight, "Sir Ralph, rescued or not, you are my prisoner: my name is Maxwell." "I agree to it," said Sir Ralph, "but pay some attention to me; for I am so desperately wounded that my drawers and greaves are full of blood." Upon this the Scots knight was very attentive to him; when suddenly hearing the cry of Moray hard by, and perceiving the earl's banner advancing to him, Sir John addressed himself to the earl of Moray, and said: "My lord, I present you with Sir Ralph Percy as a prisoner; but let good care be taken of him, for he is very badly wounded." The earl was much pleased at this, and replied, "Maxwell, thou hast well earned thy spurs this day." He then ordered his men to take every care of Sir Ralph, who bound up and stanchd his wounds. The battle still continued to rage, and no one could say at that moment which side would be the conqueror, for there were very many captures and rescues that never came to my knowledge.

The young earl of Douglas had this night performed wonders in arms. When he was struck down there was a great crowd around him; and he could not raise himself, for the blow on his head was mortal. His men had followed him as closely as they were able; and there came to him his cousins, Sir James Lindsay, Sir John and Sir Walter Sinclair, with other knights and squires. They found by his side a gallant knight that had constantly attended him, who was his chaplain, and had at this time exchanged his profession for that of a valiant man-at-arms. The whole night he had followed the earl with his battle-axe in hand, and had by his exertions more than once repulsed the English.

Sir John Sinclair asked the earl, "Cousin, how fares it with you?" "But so so," replied he. "Thanks to God, there are but few of my ancestors who have died in chambers or in their beds. I bid you, therefore, revenge my death, for I have but little hope of living, as my heart becomes every minute more faint. Do you Walter and Sir John Sinclair raise up my banner, for certainly it is on the ground, from the death of David Campbell, that valiant squire, who bore it, and who refused knighthood from my hands this day, though he was equal to the most eminent knights for courage or loyalty; and continue to shout 'Douglas!' but do not tell friend or foe whether I am in your company or not; for, should the enemy know the truth, they will be greatly rejoiced." The two brothers Sinclair and Sir John Lindsay obeyed his orders. The banner was raised and "Douglas!" shouted.

Their men, who had remained behind, hearing the shouts of "Douglas!" so often repeated ascended a small eminence, and pushed their lances with such courage that the English were repulsed, and many killed or struck to the ground. The Scots, by thus valiantly driving the enemy beyond the spot where the earl of Douglas lay dead, for he had expired on giving his last orders, arrived at his banner, which was borne by Sir John Sinclair. Numbers

[1388 A.D.]

were continually increasing, from the repeated shouts of "Douglas!" and the greater part of the Scots knights and squires were now there. The earls of Moray and March, with their banners and men, came thither also. When they were all thus collected, perceiving the English retreat, they renewed the battle with greater vigour than before.

To say the truth, the English had harder work than the Scots, for they had come by a forced march that evening from Newcastle on Tyne, which was eight English leagues distant, to meet the Scots, by which means the greater part were exceedingly fatigued before the combat began. The Scots, on the contrary, had reposed themselves, which was to them of the utmost advantage, as was apparent from the event of the battle. In this last attack, they so completely repulsed the English that the latter could never rally again, and the former drove them far beyond where the earl of Douglas lay on the ground. Sir Henry Percy, during this attack, had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the lord Montgomery, a very valiant knight of Scotland. They had long fought hand to hand with much valour, and without hindrance from any one; for there was neither knight nor squire of either party who did not find there his equal to fight with, and all were fully engaged. In the end Sir Henry was made prisoner by the lord Montgomery.

I was told by those who were of the victorious party, that at this battle, which was fought in the year of grace 1388, between Newcastle and Otterburn, on the 19th day of August, there were taken or left dead on the field, on the side of the English, one thousand and forty men of all descriptions; in the pursuit eight hundred and forty, and more than one thousand wounded. Of the Scots there were only about one hundred slain and two hundred made prisoners. As the English were flying, they at times rallied, and returned to combat those who were pursuing them whenever they thought they had a favourable opportunity, and it was thus their loss was so considerable in the pursuit. You may judge, from the number of killed and prisoners on each side, if this battle was not hardily fought.

It was told me, and I believe it, that the Scots gained 200,000 francs from the ransoms, and that never since the battle of Bannockburn, when the Bruce, Sir William Douglas, Sir Robert de Versy, and Sir Simon Fraser pursued the English for three days, have they had so complete nor so gainful a victory.^c

LAST YEARS OF ROBERT II (1388-1390 A.D.)

Such was the more romantic than important battle of Otterburn, which cost the Scots one of their bravest chieftains, and was perpetuated in a lasting feud between the houses of Percy and Douglas. For ages afterwards this engagement continued to be celebrated by the borders on both sides as that in which the valour of each had been put to its greatest trial, and had passed through the trial with the least blot. It has been here described in the words of Froissart,^c and even the minutest incidents of this eventful field, as told by the contemporary historian, afford us too vivid a picture of the manners and sentiments of the times to be passed over in neglect. There are several versions, Scotch and English, of the ancient ballad on the battle of Otterburn, but the oldest is certainly the English ballad printed by Bishop Percy^c from a manuscript in the Cottonian library.

Froissart's account is, no doubt, in general correct, though on some parts he was certainly wrongly informed, and he appears to have been a little prejudiced by the circumstance that his informants were, as he confesses, either Scots or Frenchmen. As he informs us that about a third part of the

[1388-1390 A.D.]

whole Scottish army had marched under Douglas into the county of Durham, Froissart's account of the disparity of numbers must be exaggerated, and it is not easy to understand from his account the still greater disparity of the numbers of killed and wounded. He was mistaken even in the date of the battle, which was fought on Wednesday, August 5th, 1388.

We cannot tell why, in this matter, Tytler⁷ should prefer the authority of Froissart to that of the Scottish historians. Andrew de Wyntoun⁸ makes the number of the Scots at Otterburn much greater. The English ballad, naturally enough, makes them more numerous than the English, which seems improbable. The death of Douglas was lamented in Scotland, and became the subject of various traditions. According to one of these, he was killed treacherously by one of his own grooms. According to another story, a prophecy in Douglas' family foretold that he should gain a victory by his death.

The Scots were long proud of this victory, though it added nothing to their national glory, like the battle of Stirling and Bannockburn; for it was but the result of a border foray, in a war undertaken against the will of their king, to gratify the restless feelings of the feudal barons.

King Robert remained still adverse to war, and as years and infirmities gained upon him, and the turbulence of his subjects increased, he now agreed to yield up, at least, the power of a king, and in a parliament held at Edinburgh, in 1389, the earl of Fife, Robert's second son, an ambitious and intriguing man, was chosen regent of the kingdom. The earl of Carrick, who was the next heir to the crown, was passed over on account of his alleged incapacity, for he had been lamed by the kick of a horse, and it was pretended that he was no longer fitted for the active management of affairs. Perhaps this pretence was but a cover for the intrigues of his younger brother. The first acts of the new regent gave no great promise of future statesmanship, for he lowered the dignity of the ruler of Scotland to embark in a petty quarrel with the English borderers. Soon afterwards a truce of three years was concluded between England and France, and Scotland was prevailed upon to be a party to the cessation of hostilities.

The earl of Fife was not destined to enjoy long the honours of the regency. Soon after the truce just mentioned, King Robert retired to his castle of Dundonald, in Ayrshire, to enjoy the repose to which he was becoming daily more attached, and his love of which had now been increased by sickness. He died there on May 13th, 1390, at the age of seventy-four, and his remains were deposited in the abbey of Scone.^d

THE EARL OF CARRICK BECOMES ROBERT III (1390-1406 A.D.)

The character of John, earl of Carrick, eldest son and successor of Robert II, has been already noticed. He was lame in body and feeble in mind, well-meaning, pious, benevolent, and just; but totally disqualified, from want of personal activity and mental energy, to hold the reins of government of a fierce and unmanageable people. The new king was invested with his sovereignty at Scone in the usual manner, excepting that, instead of his own name, John, he assumed the title of Robert III, to comply with a superstition of his people, who were impressed with a belief that the former name had distinguished monarchs of England, France, and Scotland, all of whom had been unfortunate. The Scots had also a partiality for the name of Robert, in affectionate and grateful remembrance of Robert Bruce.

The new monarch had been wedded for nigh thirty-three years to Annabella Drummond, daughter of Sir John Drummond of Stobhall, a Scottish

[1300-1309 A.D.]

lady whose wisdom and virtues corresponded with her ancient family and exalted station. By this union he had one son, Prince David, a youth of eighteen years, whose calamitous history and untimely death were doomed to darken his father's reign. Five years after Robert III had occupied the throne the queen bore a second son, named James, his father's successor, and the first of that name, afterwards so often repeated in the royal line, who swayed the Scottish sceptre. The new monarch's first attention was to confirm the truce with England, and renew the league with France, so that for eight years the kingdom was freed from the misery of external war, though the indolence of a feeble sovereign left it a prey to domestic feud and the lawless oppression of contending chiefs and nobles. To use a scriptural expression, every one did what seemed right in his own eyes, as if there had been no king in Scotland. The mode by which the government endeavoured to stanch these disorders and indirectly to get rid of the perpetrators of outrages which they dared not punish by course of justice, was equally wild and savage.

RIVALRY OF THE DUKES OF ROTHESAY AND ALBANY

The weak-minded king seems to have carried on his government, such as it was, by the assistance of his brother, the earl of Fife, who had been regent in the later years of his father's reign. But his heir-apparent, David, being a youth of good abilities, handsome person, young, active, and chivalrous, was too prominent and popular to be altogether laid out of view. He was raised by his father, after a solemn council, to the title of duke of Rothesay. At the same time, to maintain some equality, if not an ascendancy, over his nephew, Prince David's ambitious uncle Robert contrived to be promoted from being earl of Fife to duke of Albany. Under their new titles both the princes negotiated on the English frontiers, but to little purpose; for though a foundation of a solid peace would have been acceptable to Richard II, who was then bent on his expedition to Ireland, yet the revolution of 1399 was now at hand which hurled that sovereign from his throne, and placed there in his stead Henry IV, thus commencing the long series of injuries and wars betwixt York and Lancaster.

Leaving foreign affairs for a short time, we can see that the young heir of the kingdom was for some time trusted by his father in affairs of magnitude. Nay, it is certain that he was at one time declared regent of the kingdom. But Rothesay's youth and precipitate ardour could not compete with the deep craft of Albany, who seems to have possessed the king's ear, by the habitual command which he exercised over him for so many years. It was easy for him to exaggerate every excess of youth of which Rothesay might be guilty, and to stir up against the young prince the suspicions which often lodge in the bosom of an aged and incapable sovereign against a young and active successor.

Albany publicly announced that the hand of the duke of Rothesay should, like a commodity exposed to open auction, be assigned to the daughter of that peer of Scotland who might agree to pay the largest dowry with his bride. Even this base traffic on such a subject Albany contrived to render yet more vile by the dishonest manner in which it was conducted. George earl of March proved the highest offerer on this extraordinary occasion, and having paid down a part of the proposed portion, his daughter was affianced to the

[¹Bain^a thinks that the titles may have been granted to put them on an equality with the English commissioners, the dukes of York, Albemarle, etc.]

duke of Rothesay. The earl of Douglas, envying the aggrandisement which the house of March must have derived from such a union, interfered, and prevailed upon Albany, who was perhaps not unwilling to mix up the nuptials of his nephew with yet more disgraceful circumstances, to break off the treaty entered into with March, and substitute an alliance with the daughter of Douglas himself. No other apology was offered to March for this breach of contract than that the marriage treaty had not been confirmed by the estates of the kingdom; and, to sum up the injustice with which he was treated, the government refused or delayed to refund the sum of money which had been advanced by him as part of his daughter's marriage-portion. As the power of the earl of March lay on the frontiers of both kingdoms, the bonds of allegiance had never sat heavily on that great family, and a less injury than that which the present earl had received might have sufficed to have urged him into rebellion. Accordingly, he instantly entered into a secret negotiation with Henry IV, and soon afterwards took refuge in England

WAR WITH HENRY IV OF ENGLAND (1400 A.D.)

Very nearly at the precise period when Henry IV made himself master of the crown of England, the existing truce between Scotland and that country expired; and the Scottish borderers, instigated by their restless temper, made fierce incursions on the opposite frontier.

In 1400, Henry therefore summoned the whole military force of England to meet him at York, and published an arrogant manifesto, in which he vindicated the antiquated claim of supremacy, which had been so long in abeyance, and, assuming the tone of lord paramount, commanded the Scottish king, with his prelates and nobles, to meet him at Edinburgh and render homage. Of course no one attended upon that summons excepting the new proselyte March, who met Henry at Newcastle, and was received to the English fealty. But if Henry's boast of subjecting Scotland was a bravado inconsistent with his usual wisdom, his warfare, on the contrary, was marked by a degree of forbearance and moderation too seldom the characteristic of an English invader. Penetrating as far as Edinburgh, he extended his especial protection to the canons of Holyrood, from whom his father, John of Gaunt, had experienced shelter, and in general spared religious houses.

The castle of Edinburgh was gallantly held out by the duke of Rothesay, aided by the skill and experience of his father-in-law the earl of Douglas. Albany commanded a large army, which, according to the ancient Scottish policy, hovered at some distance from the English host. The Scots had wisely resolved upon the defensive system of war. Henry found nothing was to be won by residing in a wasted country to beleaguer an impregnable rock. He raised the siege and retired into England, where the rebellion of Owen Glendower soon after broke out. A truce of twelve months and upwards took place betwixt the kingdoms.

THE DEATH OF ROTHESAY (1401 A.D.)

In this interval a shocking example, in Scotland, proved how ambition can induce men to overleap all boundaries. We have seen the duke of Rothesay stoutly defending the castle of Edinburgh in 1400. But when the war was ended he seems to have fallen into the king his father's displeasure. Deceived by malicious reports of his son's wildness and indocility, the simple old king was induced to grant a commission to Albany to arrest his son, and detain

[1401-1402 A.D.]

him for some time in captivity, to tame the stubborn spirit of profligacy by which he had been taught to believe him possessed. But the unnatural kinsman was determined on taking the life of his nephew, the heir of his too confiding brother. The duke of Rothesay was trepanned into Fife, made prisoner, and conducted to Falkland Castle, where he was immured in a dungeon, and starved to death. Old historians affirm that the compassion of two females protracted his life and his miseries, one by supplying him from time to time with thin cakes of barley, another after the manner of the Roman charity. It is not likely that, where so stern a purpose was adopted, any access would be permitted to such means of relief.

The death of the prince was imputed to a dysentery. Inquiry was made into the circumstances by a parliament, which was convened under the management of the authors of the murder. Albany and Douglas acknowledged having arrested the prince, vindicating themselves by the royal mandate for that act of violence, but imputed his death to disease. Yet they showed a consciousness of guilt, by taking out a pardon in terms as broad and comprehensive as might shroud them from any subsequent charge for the murder which they denied, as well as for the arrest which they avowed.¹

DOUGLAS LOSES TO HOTSPUR AT HOMILDON (1402 A.D.)

The truce with England was ended in 1402, and Douglas hastened to border warfare. But fortune seemed to have abandoned him. From this time, notwithstanding his valour and military skill, he lost so many of his followers in each action which he fought as to merit the name of "Tyneman" (*i.e.*, lose-man).

Douglas obtained a considerable force under command of Albany's son, Murdoch earl of Fife, with the earls of Angus, Moray, and Orkney. His own battalions augmented the force to ten thousand men, and spread plunder and devastation as far as the gates of Newcastle. But Sir Henry Percy (the celebrated Hotspur) had assembled a numerous array, and together with his father, the earl of Northumberland, and their ally March, engaged the Scots at Homildon, a hill within a mile of Wooler, on which Douglas had posted his army. Hotspur was about to rush with his characteristic impetuosity on the Scottish ranks, when the earl of March, laying hand on his bridle, advised him first to try the effects of the archery. The bowmen of England did their duty with their usual fatal certainty and celerity, and the Scottish army, drawn up on the acclivity, presented a fatal mark to their shafts. Douglas showed an inclination to ascend the hill; but encountering a little precipice in the descent which had not been before perceived, the Scottish ranks became confused and broken, their disarray enabling the archers, who had fallen a little back, to continue their fatal volley, which now descended as upon an irregular mob. The rout became general. Very many Scots were slain. Douglas was made captive: five wounds and the loss of an eye showed he had done his duty as a soldier, though not as a general. Murdoch earl of Fife, son of the regent Albany, with the earls of Moray and Angus, and about twenty chiefs and men of eminence, became also prisoners.

Great was the joy of Hotspur over this victory, and great the pleasure of Henry IV when the news reached him. Yet fate had so decreed that the

[¹ Hume Brown 'thinks the circumstances of Rothesay's death suspicious in those days, but finds no evidence against Albany or Douglas. Wyntoun 'does not hint at murder, and Bower 'does little more than report a rumor.]

[1403-1409 A.D.]

victory of Homildon became the remote cause that the monarch's throne was endangered, and that Percy lost his life in a rebellious conspiracy at Shrewsbury in 1403.

CAPTURE OF JAMES; DEATH OF ROBERT III; REGENCY OF ALBANY
(1406 A.D.)

Some proposals made for peace only produced a feverish truce of brief duration. Meantime Prince James, the only surviving son of the poor, infirm old king, being now in his eleventh year, required better education than Scotland could afford, and protection more efficient than that of his debilitated father. The youthful prince was, therefore, committed to the care of Wardlaw, bishop of Saint Andrews, and was by his advice to be sent to France. He was embarked accordingly, Henry Sinclair, earl of Orkney, being appointed as his governor. The vessel in which he was embarked had not gained Flamborough Head when she was taken by an English corsair [probably in February or March, 1406]. As the truce at the time actually subsisted, this capture of the prince was in every respect contrary to the law of nations. But knowing the importance of possessing the royal hostage, Henry resolved to detain him at all events. "In fact," he said, "the Scots ought to have given me the education of this boy, for I am an excellent French scholar." Apparently this new disaster was an incurable wound to the old king. His death, April 4th, 1406, made no change in public affairs, and was totally unfelt in the administration, which continued in the hands of Albany, whose rule was not unpopular. This was in a great measure effected by liberality, or rather by profusion, in which he indulged with less hesitation, as his gifts were at the expense of the royal revenues and authority. The clergy, who were edified by his bounties to the church, recorded his devotion in their chronicles. He connived at the excesses of power frequent among the nobility; solaced them with frequent and extravagant entertainments, and indulged all their most unreasonable wishes respecting lands and jurisdictions at the expense of the crown. An air of affability and familiarity, added to a noble presence and a splendid attendance, procured the shouts of the populace. Although timid, the regent was conscious of his own defect, and careful in concealing it. He was intelligent in public business; and when the interest of the country was identified with his own, he could pursue with expedition and eagerness the best paths for attaining it.

When Robert the third, therefore, died, the right of his brother the duke of Albany to the regency during the captivity of James was universally acknowledged. His government commenced with a show of prosperity. He renewed the league offensive and defensive with the kingdom of France, and entered into negotiation with England. In the communings which ensued he made no application for the liberation of his nephew, the present sovereign, nor was his name even mentioned in the transaction. But the earl of Douglas, whose military services were valuable to the defence of the frontier, was restored to freedom, having been taken at the battle of Shrewsbury, where he had fought on the side of Sir Henry Percy with his usual distinguished valour, beating down the king of England with his own hand, but being in the course of the conflict himself made prisoner, according to his habitual bad luck. George, earl of March, had rendered Henry IV effectual assistance during that insurrection, being the first who apprised that monarch of the conspiracy against him. But he was now weary of his exile, and, disappointed of his revenge, returned to his allegiance to Scotland, upon restoration of

[1409-1411 A.D.]

his estates. These were great points gained in reference to defence upon the border.

The truce with England not having been renewed, hostilities were recommenced by an exploit of the warlike inhabitants of Teviotdale, who, vexed by the English garrison which had retained the important castle of Jedburgh, stormed and took that strong fortress. It was resolved in parliament that it should be destroyed; but as the walls were extensive and very strongly built, and the use of gunpowder in mining was not yet understood, it was proposed that a tax of two pennies should be imposed on each hearth in Scotland to maintain the labourers employed in the task. The regent declared that in his administration no burden should be imposed on the poor, and caused the expense to be defrayed out of the royal revenue. The truce with England was afterwards renewed. In the ratification of it, Albany styled himself regent by the grace of God, and used the phrase "our subjects of Scotland," not satisfied, it would seem, with delegated authority.

THE LORD OF THE ISLES DEFEATED AT HARLAW (1411 A.D.)

In the mean time a contest of the most serious nature arose between the Celtic and the Lowland or Saxon population of Scotland. The lords of the Isles, during the utter confusion which extended through Scotland during the regency, had found it easy to reassume that independence of which they had been deprived during the vigorous reign of Robert Bruce. They possessed a fleet with which they harassed the mainland at pleasure; and Donald, who now held that insular lordship, ranked himself among the allies of England, and made peace and war as an independent sovereign. The regent had taken no steps to reduce this kinglest to obedience, and would probably have shunned engaging in a task so arduous, had not Donald insisted upon pretensions to the earldom of Ross, occupying a great extent in the northwest of Scotland, including the large isle of Skye, and lying adjacent to and connected with his own insular dominions.

The lord of the Isles determined to assert his right by arms. He led an army of ten thousand Hebrideans and Highlanders, headed by their chieftains, into Ross.

The consequence of Donald's succeeding in his pretensions must have been the loss to the regent of the earldom which he had destined to one of his own family, and most serious evils to the kingdom of Scotland, since it would have been a conquest by the savage over the civilised inhabitants, and must in the sequel have tended to the restoration of barbarism with all its evils.

Alexander Stuart, earl of Mar, hastily assembled the chivalry of the Lowlands to stop the desolating march of Donald and his army.

The whole Lowland gentry of Kincardine and Aberdeenshire rose in arms with the earl of Mar. The town of Aberdeen sent out a gallant body of citizens under Sir Robert Davidson, their provost; Ogilvie, the sheriff of Angus, brought up his own martial name and the principal gentlemen of that county. Yet when both armies met at Harlaw, near the head of the Garioch, July 24th, 1411, the army of Mar was considerably inferior to that of Donald of the Isles, under whose banner the love of arms and hope of plunder had assembled the Macintoshes and other more northern clans. Being the flower of the respective races, the Gaelic and Saxon armies joined battle with the most inveterate rage and fury. About a thousand Highlanders fell, together with two high chiefs of Macintosh and McLean. Mar's loss did not exceed half

[1411-1417 A.D.]

the number, but comprehended many gentlemen, as, indeed, his forces chiefly consisted of such. The provost of Aberdeen was killed, with so many citizens as to occasion a municipal regulation that the chief magistrate of that town, acting in that capacity, should go only a certain brief space from the precincts of the liberties.

The battle of Harlaw might in some degree be considered as doubtful; but all the consequences of victory remained with the Lowlanders. The insular lord retreated after the action, unable to bring his discouraged troops to a second battle. The regent Albany acted on the occasion with a spirit and promptitude which his government seldom evinced. He placed himself at the head of a new army, and occupied the disputed territory of Ross, where he took and garrisoned the castle of Dingwall. In the next summer he assembled a fleet, threatened Donald of the Isles with an invasion of his territories, and compelled him to submit himself to the allegiance of Scotland, and give hostages for his obedience in future.

The battle of Harlaw and its consequences were of the highest importance, since they might be said to decide the superiority of the more civilised regions of Scotland over those inhabited by the Celtic tribes, who remained almost as savage as their forefathers the Dalriads. The Highlands and Isles continued, indeed, to give frequent disturbance by their total want of subordination and perpetual incursions upon their neighbours; but they did not again venture to combine their forces for a simultaneous attack upon the Lowlands, with the hope of conquest and purpose of settlement.

Another mark of the advance of civilisation was the erection of the university of Saint Andrews, February, 1414, which was founded and endowed under the auspices of Henry Wardlaw, archbishop of Saint Andrews, cardinal, and the pope's legate for Scotland.

In his intercourse with England the regent Albany was very singularly situated. His most important negotiations with that power respected the fate of two prisoners—the one James, his nephew and prince, who had fallen, as already mentioned, into the hands of Henry IV by a gross breach of the law of nations, the other being the regent's own son Murdoch, earl of Fife, taken in the battle of Homildon. Respecting these captives the views of Albany were extremely different. He was bound to make some show of a desire to have his sovereign, James, set at liberty, since not only the laws of common allegiance and family affection enjoined him to make an apparent exertion in his nephew's behalf, but the feudal constitutions, which imposed on the vassal the charge of ransoming his lord and superior when captive, rendered this in every point of view an inviolable obligation. At the same time his policy dictated to him to protract as long as possible the absence of the king of Scotland, with whose return his own power as regent must necessarily terminate. For the liberation of his son Murdoch, on the contrary, the regent naturally was induced to interfere with all the ardour and sincerity of paternal feeling.

The death of Henry IV and the accession of Henry V did not greatly alter the situation of the two countries, but was so far of advantage to Albany that he obtained the liberation of his son Murdoch earl of Fife, in exchange for the young earl of Northumberland, the son of the celebrated Hotspur. This youth had been sent into Scotland by his grandfather for safety, when about to display his banner against Henry IV of England.

In 1417, while Henry V was engaged in France, the regent Albany, supposing that the greater part of the English forces were over seas, gathered a large force, and besieged at once both Roxburgh Castle and the town of Ber-

[1417-1423 A.D.]

wick. A much superior army of English advanced under the dukes of Exeter and Bedford, and compelled the regent of Scotland to raise both the sieges, with much loss of reputation, as the Scots bestowed on his ill-advised enterprise the name of the "Fool's Raid."

In a parliament in 1419 the Scottish estates agreed to send the dauphin of France, now hard pressed by the victorious Henry, a considerable body of auxiliary troops, under the command of the regent's second son, John Stuart earl of Buchan. This was the last act of Albany's administration which merits historical notice. After having governed Scotland as prime minister



DOUNE CASTLE

Famous as Residence of Murdoch

of Robert I and Robert II, and as regent for James I for fifty years, he died at the age of eighty and upwards in 1420. The duke of Albany as a statesman was an unprincipled politician, and as a soldier of suspected courage. As a ruler he had his merits. He was wise and prudent in his government, regular in the administration of justice, and merciful in the infliction of punishment. If Scotland made no great figure under his administration, he contrived to secure her against any considerable loss.

THE REGENCY OF MURDOCH (1420 A.D.), AND THE LIBERATION OF JAMES I (1424 A.D.)

Murdoch earl of Fife succeeded to his father in his title as duke of Albany, and his high office as regent of Scotland.

The evils which attended the feeble and remiss government of this second duke of Albany were aggravated by a contagious disease, resembling a fever and dysentery, which wasted the land universally and cut off many victims.

Murdoch duke of Albany became in the space of three years weary of exercising an administration which was popular with no man, over a disorderly country, wasted by pestilence, and divided by the feuds of the nobility. He

determined to rid himself of the responsibility of the regency. In 1423 his decision is said by tradition to have been precipitated by an act of insolent insubordination on the part of Walter, his eldest son. The regent Murdoch had a falcon which he highly valued, and which his son Walter had often asked of him in vain. Exasperated at repeated refusal, the insolent young man snatched the bird as it sate on his father's wrist, and killed it by twisting round its neck. Deeply hurt at this brutal act of disrespect, Murdoch dropped the ominous words, "Since you will render me no honour or obedience, I will bring home one who well knows how to make all of us obey him." From this time he threw into the long-protracted negotiation for the freedom of James a sincerity which speedily brought it to a conclusion.

Henry V being now dead, John duke of Bedford, protector of England, was willing to use a liberal policy towards Scotland; to restore their lawful king, so long unjustly detained; having formed, if possible, such an alliance betwixt him and some English lady of rank as might maintain in the young monarch's mind the feelings of predilection towards England which were the natural consequence of a long residence in that country and familiarity with its laws and manners. He thus hoped at once to enlarge James, to make a friend of him, and to secure England against further interference on the part of Scotland in the wars with France, where the army of auxiliaries, under the earl of Buchan, had produced a marked effect upon the last campaigns.^k

Buchan and Douglas the Tyneman, were both killed at Verneuil in 1424 in a battle with the duke of Bedford. Buchan had previously, in a battle at Baugé, killed the duke of Clarence, Henry V's brother, with his own hand.^a

The corps of Scots, long maintained as the French king's bodyguard, is said to have been originally composed of the relics of the field of Verneuil. And thus concluded the wars of the Scots in France, fortunate that the nation was cured, though by a most bitter remedy, of the fatal rage of selling their swords and their blood as mercenaries in foreign service; a practice which drains a people of the best and bravest, who ought to reserve their courage for its defence, and converts them into common gladiators, whose purchased valour is without fame to themselves or advantage to their country. Individuals frequently continued to join the French standard, in quest of fame or preferment; but, after the battle of Verneuil, no considerable army or body of troops from Scotland was sent over to France.^k

FIRST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS

It was in the midst of this period that the doctrines of Wycliffe for the first time appeared in Scotland, and the flames of war had scarcely ceased when the more dreadful flames of religious persecution and martyrdom were kindled in the country. John Resby, an English priest of the school of this great reformer, had passed into Scotland either in consequence of the persecutions of Wycliffe's followers, which arose after his death, or from a desire to propagate the doctrine. After having for some time remained unnoticed, the boldness and the novelty of his opinions at length wakened the jealousy of the church; and it was found that he preached what were at that time esteemed the most dangerous heresies. He was immediately seized by Laurence of Lindores, an eminent doctor in theology, and compelled to appear before a council of the clergy, where this inquisitor presided. Here he was accused of maintaining no fewer than forty heresies, amongst which the principal were, a denial of the authority of the pope, as the successor of St. Peter, a contemptuous opinion of the utility of penances and auricular confession,

[1405-1424 A.D.]


and an assertion that a holy life was absolutely necessary in any one who dared to call himself the vicar of Christ.

Although Resby was esteemed an admirable preacher by the common people, his eloquence, as may easily be supposed, was thrown away upon the ecclesiastical judges before whom he defended himself. Laurence of Lindores was equally triumphant in his confutation of the written conclusions, and in his answers to the spoken arguments by which their author attempted to support them; and the brave and pious disciple was condemned to the flames, and delivered over to the secular arm. The sentence was carried into immediate execution, and he was burned at Perth in the year 1405, his books and writings being consumed in the same fire with their master. It is probable that the church was stimulated to this unwonted severity by Albany the governor, whose bitter hatred to all Lollards and heretics, and zeal for the purity of the Catholic faith, are particularly recorded by Wyntoun.^g And here, in the first example of martyrdom for religious opinions which is recorded in our history, the inevitable effects of persecution and proscription were clearly discernible in the increased zeal and affection which were evinced for the opinions which had been canonised by the blood of the preacher. The conclusions and little pamphlets of this early reformer were piously concealed and preserved by his disciples; and any who had imbibed his opinions evinced a resolution and courage in maintaining them, which resisted every attempt to restore them to the bosom of the church. They did not dare, indeed, to disseminate them openly, but they met, and read, and debated in secret.

AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE

During the whole course of this reign the agriculture of Scotland appears to have been in a very lamentable condition; a circumstance arising, no doubt, out of the constant interruption of the regular seasons of rural labour, the ravages committed by foreign invasion, and the havoc which necessarily attended the passage even of a Scottish army from one part of the country to another. The proof of this is to be found in the frequent licenses which are granted by the English king, allowing the nobles and the merchants of Scotland to import grain into that country, and in the circumstance that the grain for the victualling of the Scottish castles, then in the hands of the English, was not unfrequently brought from Ireland. The commercial spirit of the country during this reign was undoubtedly on the increase; and the trade which it carried on with Flanders appears to have been conducted with much enterprise and activity. Mercer, a Scottish merchant, during his residence in France, was, from his great wealth, admitted to the favour and confidence of Charles VI; and on one occasion the cargo of a Scottish merchantman, which had been captured by the English, was valued as high as seven thousand marks, an immense sum for those remote times. The staple source of export wealth continued to consist in wool, hides, skins, and wool-fells; and we have the evidence of Froissart,^h who had himself travelled in the country, that its home manufactures were in a very low condition.ⁱ

We return to consider the condition of Scotland, now more hopeful than it had been for a length of time, since she was about to exchange the rule of a slothful, timid, and inefficient regent for that of a king in the flower of his age, and possessed of a natural disposition and cultivated talents equally capable to grace and to guard the throne.^k



CHAPTER VIII

ROYALTY VS. NOBILITY

JAMES I TO JAMES III

[1424-1487 A.D.]

It is said, that when James I first entered the kingdom, the dreadful description given by one of his nobles of the unbridled licentiousness and contempt of the laws which everywhere prevailed, threw him for a moment off his guard. "Let God but grant me life," cried he, according to Fordun,^b "and there shall not be a spot in my dominions where the key shall not keep the castle, and the furze-bush the cow, though I myself should lead the life of a dog to accomplish it."—P. F. TYTLER.^c

THE terms on which the treaty for the freedom of James I had been at last fixed, and were, on the whole, liberal rather than otherwise. The English demanded, and the Scots agreed to pay, 40,000*l.* sterling, not as "ransom"—as the use of that obnoxious phrase could not apply to the case of an innocent boy taken without defence in time of truce—but to defray what was delicately termed the expenses of Prince James' support and education. Six years were allowed for the discharge of the sum by half-yearly payments. It was a part of the contract that the Scottish king should marry an English lady of rank; and his choice fell upon Joan Beaufort, niece of Richard II, by the mother's side, and by her father, John, duke of Somerset, the granddaughter of the duke of Lancaster, called John of Gaunt. To this young lady, so nearly connected with the English royal family, the Scottish captive had been attached for some time, and had celebrated her charms in poetry of no mean order, although defaced by the rudeness of the obsolete language.^d Thus in his famous poem, *The King's Quair* (i.e., Quire), he speaks of his eighteen years' captivity, and then of his vision of the woman he later married:

[1434 A.D.]

"The bird, the beste, the fisch eke in the see,
 They lyve in fredome everich in his kynd;
 And I a man, and lakkith libertee.
 Quhat schall I seyne, quhat resoun may I fynd,
 That fortune suld do so? Thus in my mynd
 My folk I would argewe; but al for noght;
 Was none that might, that on my peynes rought."

* * * * *
 "And therewith kest I doun myn eye ageyne
 Quhare as I saw walkyng under the Toure
 Full secretly, new cumyn hir to pleyne,
 The fairest or the freschest zoung floure
 That ever I sawe methoght before that houre.
 For quhich sodain abate, anon astert
 The blude of all my body to my hert.

"And though I stood abaisit tha a lyte,
 No wonder was; for-quhy my wittis all
 Were so overcome with plesance and delyte,
 Onely through latting of myn eyen fall,
 That sudaynly my hert became hir thrall
 For ever of free wyll; for of menace
 There was no takyn in hir suete face." *

On his release James and Joan were married in London; and a discharge for ten thousand pounds, the fourth part of the stipulated ransom, was presented to the Scottish king as the dowry or portion of his bride. The royal pair were then sent down to Scotland with all respect and dignity, and Murdoch, the late regent, had the honour to induct his royal cousin into the throne of his forefathers.

The natural talents of James I, both mental and corporeal, were of the highest quality; and if Henry IV had taken an unjust and cruel advantage of the accident which threw the prince into his hands, by detaining him as a prisoner, he had made the only possible amends by causing the most sedulous attention to be paid to his education. In person, the king of Scotland was of low stature, but so strongly and compactly built as to excel in the games of chivalry and all the active accomplishments of the time. He was no less distinguished by mental gifts, highly cultivated by the best teachers that England could produce. He was, according to the learning of the day, an accomplished scholar, an excellent poet, a musician of skill, intimately acquainted with the science as practised in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, which are described as being then the principal seats of national music, with a decided taste for the fine arts of architecture, painting, and horticulture. Nothing, therefore, could be more favourable than his personal character. As a prince, his education in England had taught him political views which he could hardly have learned in his own rude and ignorant realm. His ardent thirst for knowledge made the acquisition of every species of art fit to be learned by persons of his condition not only tolerable, however laborious, but a source of actual pleasure.^d

JAMES I ATTACKS THE POWER OF THE LORDS

The civil transactions in Scotland are better known since the beginning of the reign of James I, and a complete series of her laws supplies the defects of her historians. During his long residence in England he had an opportunity of observing the feudal system in a more advanced state, and refined from many of the imperfections which still adhered to it in his own kingdom. He saw there nobles great, but not independent; a king powerful, though far

[1424-1425 A.D.]

from absolute; he saw a regular administration of government, wise laws enacted, and a nation flourishing and happy, because all ranks of men were accustomed to obey them. Full of these ideas, he returned into his native country, which presented to him a very different scene. The royal authority, never great, was now contemptible, by having been so long delegated to regents. The ancient patrimony and revenues of the crown were almost totally alienated. During his long absence the name of king was little known, and less regarded. The license of many years had rendered the nobles independent. Universal anarchy prevailed. The weak were exposed to the rapine and oppression of the strong. In every corner some barbarous chieftain ruled at pleasure, and neither feared the king nor pitied the people.

James was too wise a prince to employ open force immediately to correct such inveterate evils. Neither the men nor the times would have borne it. He applied the gentler and less offensive remedy of laws and statutes. In a parliament held immediately after his return, he gained the confidence of his people by many wise laws, tending visibly to re-establish order, tranquillity, and justice in the kingdom. But at the same time that he endeavoured to secure these blessings to his subjects, he discovered his intention to recover those possessions of which the crown had been unjustly bereaved; and for that purpose obtained an act by which he was empowered to summon such as had obtained crown lands during the three last reigns to produce the rights by which they held them. As this statute threatened the property of the nobles, another which passed in a subsequent parliament aimed a dreadful blow at their power. By it the leagues and combinations which we have already described, and which rendered the nobles so formidable to the crown, were declared unlawful.

Encouraged by this success in the beginning of his enterprise, James' next step was still bolder and more decisive. During the sitting of parliament he seized at once his cousin Murdoch, duke of Albany, and his sons, the earls of Douglas, Lennox, Angus, March, and above twenty other peers and barons of prime rank.' To all of them, however, he was immediately reconciled, except to Albany and his sons, and Lennox. These were tried by their peers and condemned, for what crime is now unknown. Their execution struck the whole order with terror, and their forfeiture added considerable possessions to the crown. He seized, likewise, the earldoms of Buchan and Strathearn upon different pretexts, and that of Mar fell to him by inheritance. The patience and inactivity of the nobles, while the king was proceeding so rapidly towards aggrandising the crown, are amazing. The only obstruction he met with was from a slight insurrection headed by James Stewart, the duke of Albany's youngest son, and that was easily suppressed.

The splendour and presence of a king, to which the great men had been long unaccustomed, inspired reverence.⁴

Among various laws were enactments for the equal administration of justice, for obliging the nobility to ride with retinues no larger than they could maintain, for discontinuing the oppressive exaction of free quarters, for requiring that the Scottish youth should be trained to archery [and forbidding football that they might devote more time to archery]. Perhaps, like many reformers, this excellent prince, for such he must certainly be esteemed,

[¹ Sir J. H. Ramsay, however, says: "Scottish historians, from the time of Hector Boece downwards, have stated that James arrested some twenty-six noblemen (several of whom, by the way, were in England at the time) at Perth. The mistake has arisen from taking a parenthesis in the *Scotichronicon*^b (ii., 482) as part of the text. For the parenthesis in question see the *Liber Fluscardensis*." ^a]

[1235-1427 A.D.]

fell into an error common to those who, seeing acutely the extent of a rooted evil, attempt too hastily and too violently to remedy it by instant eradication.

James I might be more easily justified in teaching, even by strict examples of severity, the respect due to the royal person, the source of law and justice, which had fallen into contempt during the feeble regency of duke Murdoch, than in prosecution of acts of treason committed when there was no king in the land. We have the following instance of his strictness on such occasions: A nobleman of high rank, and nearly related to the crown, forgot himself so far as to strike a youth within the king's hall. James commanded that the hand with which the offence had been given should on the instant be extended on the council-table, and the young man who had received the blow was ordered to stand by with the edge of a large knife applied to the wrist of the offender, ready to sever it upon a signal given. In this posture the culprit remained for more than an hour in agonising expectation of the blow being struck, while the queen and her ladies, the prelates, and the clergy, prostrated themselves on the floor, imploring mercy for the criminal. The king at length dispensed with the punishment, but banished the offender for some time from his court and presence.

JAMES REDUCES THE LORD OF THE ISLES TO OBEDIENCE (1427 A.D.)

Besides repressing the general habits of violence and devastation in the Lowlands of Scotland, James had also to reduce to his obedience the Highland chiefs, who during the impunity of the last regency had thrown off all respect to the mandates of the crown, forgotten the terrors of the Harlaw, and might be considered as having returned to their pristine independence and barbarism. The king, with a view to remedy these evils, built or repaired the strong tower of Inverness, at which place he held a parliament. Alexander, the lord of the Isles, and his mother, the countess of Ross, with almost all the Highland chiefs, many of whom could carry into the field at least two thousand men, attended upon this assembly. The king invited them separately to visit his castle, where he had nearly fifty of them placed in arrest at the same moment; James in the mean while applauding his own dexterity in an extempore verse, of which the Latin only survives.¹ Two leaders of tribes were beheaded for acts of robbery and oppression; and to render his justice impartial, James Campbell was hanged for the murder of John, a former lord of the Isles.

In the midst of these examples of punishment, James was clement in his treatment of Alexander of the Isles, the successor of Donald, who was worsted at the Harlaw. His mother was detained as a hostage for his faith. Alexander, however, no sooner returned to his own territories than he raised his banner, and collected a host from the Isles and Highland mainland to the amount of ten thousand men, with which he invaded the continent, and burned the town of Inverness, where he had lately sustained the affront of an arrest. King James assembled an army and hastened northward, where his prompt arrival alarmed the invaders. The Highland forces sustained a severe defeat, and the lord of the Isles humbled himself to ask peace and forgiveness. It

¹ *Ad turrim fortem ducamus cautè cohortem ;
Per Christi sortem, meruerunt hi quia mortem.*

Which may be thus translated:

To donjon tower let this rude troop be driven;
For death they merit, by the cross of heaven.

was not, however, granted, till he had performed a feudal penance for his breach of allegiance. On the eve of Saint Augustine's festival he appeared in full congregation before the high altar of Holyrood church, at Edinburgh, attired only in his shirt and drawers, and there upon his knees presented the hilt of his naked sword to the king, he himself holding it by the point. In this attitude of submission the island chief humbly confessed his offences, and deprecated their deserved punishment. The capital penalty, which he had deservedly incurred, was exchanged for a long imprisonment in Tantallon castle.

The captivity of the lord of the Isles did not prevent further disturbance from these unruly people. Choosing for chieftain Donald, called Ballach or the Freckled, the cousin-german of their imprisoned lord, who exercised his power during his captivity, the islanders again invaded Lochaber with an army of wild Caterans. But deserted by those who had been accessory to his crime, Donald Ballach was forced to fly to Ireland, where he was shortly after slain, to propitiate the Scottish king, and his head sent to the court of James.

James took other and less violent methods of confirming the right of the Scottish crown, by accommodating with the Norwegians, who had heavy claims for the long arrears of an annuity, stipulated to them in the treaty with Alexander III, as the consideration for ceding their right over the Hebrides, but which the continued misfortunes of Scotland had prevented from being regularly paid.

Great pains were also taken to assure the regular distribution of government by the royal courts of justice, with the assurance that if there were any "poor creature"¹ who, for want of skill and money, could not have his cause properly stated, a skilful advocate should be engaged for him at the expense of the crown. Another law against "leasing-making" imposed the doom of death on the devisers of such falsehoods as were calculated to render the king's government odious to the people. The punishment, however severe, was not, perhaps, ill-suited to that time, when there was so little communication between different parts of the country, and one province knew so little of what was happening in another that a rumour of any unpopular measure or oppressive act on the part of the crown might put a part of the kingdom into open rebellion before it could be refuted or explained. In after times, the statute, being applied even to confidential communications between man and man, became the source of gross and iniquitous oppression.

WAR WITH ENGLAND

In relation to foreign policy, James I appears to have supported his place with dignity betwixt the contending powers of France and England. Like his predecessors, he preferred the alliance of the former kingdom, as less tempted to abuse his confidence; and his friendship was thought of such importance, that Charles of France was induced to cement it by choosing the bride of his son the dauphin, afterwards Louis XI, in the person of Margaret,

[¹ "And gif thar be ony pur creatur," the law observes, "that for defalte of cunnyng or dispens, can nocht, or may nocht follow his caus; the king, for the lufe of God, shall ordane that the juge before quhame the causs suld be determyt purway and get a lele and wys advocate to follow sic creaturis caus. And gif sic caus be obtenyt, the wrangar sall assythe the party skathit, and ye advocatis costis that travale. And gif the juge refusys to doe the lawe evinly, as is before saide, ye party plenzeand sall haf recours to ye king, ye quhilk sall as rigorously punyst sic jugis, yat it be ane ensampill till all utheris."]

[1435-1436 A.D.]

eldest daughter of the king of Scotland. The bridal took place in 1436, eight years after the contract. The honour which attended this match was great; but the bride's happiness was far from being secured in proportion. Though amiable and accomplished, she was neglected and contemned by her husband, one of the most malignant men who ever lived. She was basely calumniated also and slandered by his unworthy courtiers, and appears to have felt the imputed ignominy so sensitively that the acuteness of her feelings at length cost the princess her life.

As the affairs of the English were declining in France, from the enthusiasm universally awakened by the appearance of the maid of Orleans on the scene, an English ambassador was sent to Scotland in the person of Lord Scrope, with instructions to gain James, if possible, from his French alliance, but in vain.

It may be easily conceived that the unwonted boldness with which James carried on his favourite measures—resuming grants made in favour of the most powerful nobles; altering at his will the seat of their power, as in the case of the earl of March; interfering with and controlling their jurisdiction over their vassals; at times imprisoning the most powerful of them, as he did the earl of Douglas, his own nephew; and substituting the authority of the crown for that of the vassals, by whose greatness it had been eclipsed—was regarded with very different feelings by two classes of his subjects. With the great mass of the nation James was popular, for the people felt the protection arising from the power of the crown, which could seldom have any temptation to oppress those in middle life, and willingly took refuge under it to escape from the subordinate tyranny of the numerous barons, whose castles crowned every cliff, and for whose rapacity or violence no object was too inconsiderable. But there was a great party among the nobility who regarded James with fear and hatred, and who only wanted an opportunity to give deadly proof of the character of their feelings towards him.

The approach of war gave these evil sentiments an opportunity to display themselves. Sir Robert Ogle, an English borderer of distinction, in breach of a truce which had continued uninterrupted since King James's accession to the Scottish throne, made an incursion on the borders in 1435, and did some mischief; but was encountered by the earl of Angus near Piperden, defeated, and made prisoner. In resentment of this violence, and of an attempt on the part of the English to intercept the Scottish princess Margaret on her way to France in 1436, James declared war against England. He besieged Roxburgh Castle with the whole array of his kingdom, which was said to amount to a tumultuary multitude of nearly two hundred thousand men. After remaining fifteen days before Roxburgh, the king suddenly raised the siege and dismissed his array, upon surmise, as has been supposed, of treason in his host. That there were such practices is highly probable; and a Scottish encampment, filled with feudal levies, each man under the banner of the noble to whom he owed service, was no safe residence for a monarch who was on bad terms with his aristocracy.

THE MURDER OF JAMES I (1437 A.D.)

After dismissal of his army, James I met his parliament at Edinburgh, and employed himself and them in making several regulations for commerce, and for the impartial administration of justice. In the mean time the period of this active and good prince's labours was speedily approaching.

The chief author of his fate was Sir Robert Graham [or Graeme], uncle to

the earl of Strathearn. James, with his usual view of unfixing and gradually undermining the high power of the nobility, resumed the earldom of Strathearn and obliged the young earl to accept of the earldom of Menteith in lieu of it. This seems to have irritated the haughty spirit of the earl's uncle Sir Robert, who was likewise exasperated by having sustained a personal arrest and imprisonment, along with other men of rank, on the king's return in 1425. Entertaining these causes of personal dislike against his sovereign, Graham, in the parliament of 1436, undertook to represent to the king the grievances of the nobility; but, instead of doing so with respect and moderation, this fierce and haughty man worked himself into such extremity of passion as to make offer to arrest the monarch in name of the estates of parliament. As no one dared to support him in an attempt so arrogant, Graham was seized, and, finally, his possessions were declared forfeited, and he himself ordered into banishment.

He retired to the recesses of the Highlands, vowing revenge, and had the boldness to send forth from his lurking place a written defiance, in which he renounced the king's allegiance, and declared himself his mortal enemy. On this new proof of audacity, a reward was offered to any one who should bring in the person of Sir Robert Graham dead or alive. On this a conspiracy took place, the event of which was terrible, although we can but ill trace the motives of some of the party.

The ostensible head of the conspirators was the king's own uncle, Walter earl of Athol, son of Robert III by his second marriage. This ambitious old man was not prevented by his near alliance with the crown from plotting against his royal nephew's life, with the purpose of placing on the throne Sir Robert Stuart, his own grandson, who on his part, though favoured by the king and holding the confidential situation of chamberlain, did not hesitate to enter into so nefarious a conspiracy.

The removal of the court to Perth, where James proposed to hold his Christmas, facilitated the conspirators' enterprise, by making a sudden descent from the Highlands, a short expedition. About the 21st of February, 1437, the king, after having entertained his treacherous uncle of Athol at supper, was about to retire to rest in the Dominican monastery, which was the royal residence for the time, when it was suddenly entered by a body of three hundred men, whose admittance had been facilitated by Sir Robert Stuart, the faithless chamberlain. There is a tradition that a young lady in attendance on the queen, named Catherine Douglas, endeavoured to supply the want of a bar to the door of the royal apartment by thrusting her own arm across the staples. This slender obstacle was soon overcome. So much time had, however, been gained that the queen and her ladies had found means to let down the king into a vault beneath the apartment, from which he might have made his escape had not an entrance from the sewer to the court of the monastery been built up by his own order a day or two before, because his tennis balls were lost by entering the vault. Still, notwithstanding this obstacle, the king might have escaped, for the assassins left the apartment without finding out his place of retreat, and, having in their brutal fury wounded the queen, dispersed to seek for James in the other chambers.

Unhappily, before either the conspirators had withdrawn from the palace, or assistance had arrived, the king endeavoured, by the help of the ladies, to escape from the vault, and some of the villains returning detected him in the attempt. Two brothers, named Hall, then descended into the vault, fell fiercely upon James with their daggers, when, young, active, and fighting for his life, the king threw them down, and trode them under foot. But while

[1437 A.D.]

he was struggling with the traitors, and cutting his hands in an attempt to wrench their daggers from them, the principal conspirator, Graham, came to the assistance of his associates, and the king died by many wounds. The alarm was given at last, and the attendants of the court and domestics began to gather to the palace, from which the assassins made their escape to the Highlands, not without loss.

The queen Joan urged the pursuit of the murderers with a zeal becoming the widow of such a husband. She had enjoyed her husband's political confidence as well as his domestic affection. In the parliament of 1435, the king, impressed, perhaps, with a presentiment that his public-spirited measures might expose him to assassination, had caused the members of the estates to give written assurances of their fidelity to the queen. Upon this trying occasion they redeemed their pledge, and a close and general pursuit after the murderers took place. In the space of a month they were all apprehended in their various lurking places. Athol's grandson, Sir Robert Stuart, was executed at Edinburgh with refined tortures, in the midst of which he avowed his guilt. The aged earl admitted that his grandson had proposed such a conspiracy to him; but alleged that he did his utmost to dissuade him from engaging in it, and believed that the idea was laid aside. He was beheaded at Edinburgh, and his head, being surrounded with a crown of iron, was exposed to public view.

The principal conspirator, Sir Robert Graham, whose mind had devised, and whose hand executed the bloody deed, boldly contended that he had a right to act as he had done. The king, he said, had inflicted on him mortal injury; and he, in return, had renounced his allegiance, and sent him a formal letter of defiance. Dreadful tortures were inflicted on the regicide, which served but to show how much extremity a hardy spirit is capable to endure. He told the court that, though now executed as a traitor, he should be hereafter recollected as the man who had freed Scotland from a tyrant. But the evil spirit which had seduced him, and seemed to speak by his mouth, proved a false prophet: the immortality which his memory obtained was only conferred by a popular rhyme to this effect:

Robert Grahame,
That kill'd our king, God give him shame.⁴

Burnet⁵ calls James I "the greatest and ablest of all the Stewart kings of Scotland. To strengthen the crown, to reduce to subjection the feudal aristocracy, to elevate the small lairds and the burgesses, and to make the law respected by all, were objects of which he never lost sight." Sir J. H. Ramsay⁶ thus sums up his achievements: "He held annual parliaments; he gave Scotland a supreme court of justice; he laid the foundations of a system of statute laws; he issued stringent edicts against private war; he gave the Scotch parliaments a speaker, and endeavoured to introduce a system of representation among the minor barons. By careful supervision, and without imposing any new duties, he raised his customs from 2,200*l.* a year to an average exceeding 5,000*l.* a year. His dealings with the currency were less deserving of approval. The Scotch coin, which apparently since the beginning of the century had been rated as worth about half the English coin, by the end of his reign was depreciated to little more than a third of it. In this matter James may have followed the example of France; but in his general legislation we trace once more, after a long interval, a disposition to copy English institutions."^a

TYTLER'S ESTIMATE OF JAMES I

There was nothing little in the character of James I; his virtues and his faults were alike on a great scale; and his reign, although it embraced only a period of thirteen years—reckoning from his return to his assassination—stands forward brightly and prominently in the history of the country. Perhaps the most important changes which he introduced were the publication of the acts of parliament in the spoken language of the land; the introduction of the principle of representation by the election of the commissaries for shires; the institution of the court entitled the “session,” and the regularity



DRYBURGH ABBEY

with which he assembled the parliament. Before his time it had been the practice of the laws, the resolutions, and the judgments of the parliament to be embodied in the Latin language; a custom which evidently was calculated to retard improvement, and perpetuate the dominion of barbarism and feudal oppression. Before his time the great body of the judges, to whom the administration of the laws was intrusted, the barons within their regalities, the bailies, the sheriffs, mayors, sergeants, and other inferior officers, were incapable of reading or understanding the statutes; and the importance of the change from this state of darkness and uncertainty to that which presented them with the law speaking in their own tongue, cannot be too

[1434-1437 A.D.]

highly estimated. It is of itself enough to stamp originality upon the character of the king, and to cause us to regard his reign as an era in the legislative history of the country.

Nor was the frequency in the assembling of his parliaments of less consequence. Of these convocations of the legislature no less than thirteen occurred during his brief reign, a very striking contrast to their infrequency under the government of his predecessors. His great principle seems to have been, to govern the country through the medium of the parliament; to introduce into this august assembly a complete representation of the body of the smaller landed proprietors, and of the commercial classes; and to insist on the frequent attendance of the great temporal and spiritual lords, not, as they were formerly wont, in the character of rivals of the sovereign, surrounded by a little court, and backed by numerous bands of armed vassals, but in their accredited station, as forming the principal and essential portion of the council of the nation, bound to obey their summons to parliament upon the same principle which obliged them to give suit and service in the feudal court of their liege lord the king.

Another striking feature in James' reign was his institution of the "session," his constant anxiety for the administration of justice amongst the middle ranks and the commons, and the frequent and anxious legislative enactments for the severe and speedy punishment of offenders. His determination that "he would make the bracken-bush keep the cow"—that proverb already alluded to, and still gratefully remembered in Scotland—was carried into execution by an indefatigable activity, and a firmness so inexorable as sometimes to assume the appearance of cruelty; but in estimating his true character upon this point, it is necessary to keep clearly before our eyes the circumstances in which he found the country, and the dreadful misrule and oppression to which the weaker individuals in the states were subjected from the tyranny of the higher orders. It is impossible, however, to deny that the king was sometimes cruel and unjust, and that when Graham accused him of tyranny and oppression, he had perhaps more to say in his vindication than many historians are willing to admit.

The explanation, and, in some little measure, the excuse for this is to be found in the natural feelings of determined and undisguised hostility with which he undoubtedly regarded the family of Albany and their remotest connections. James considered the government of the father and the son in its true light—as one long usurpation; for although the first few years of Albany's administration as governor had been sanctioned by royal approval and the voice of the parliament, yet it is not to be forgotten that the detention of the youthful king in England extended through the long and sickening period of nineteen years, during the greater part of which time the return of this prince to his throne and to his people was thwarted, as we have seen, by every possible intrigue upon the part of Albany.

This base conduct was viewed by James with more unforgiving resentment from its being crowned with success; for the aged usurper by a quiet death escaped the meditated vengeance, and transmitted the supreme authority in the state to his son, ransomed from captivity for this very end, whilst his lawful prince beheld himself still detained in England. When he did return, therefore, it was not to be wondered at that his resentment was wrought to a high pitch; and deep and bloody as was the retribution which he exacted, it was neither unnatural nor, according to the feelings of those times, unjustifiable. But making every allowance for the extraordinary wrongs he had suffered, the determination which he appears to have formed, of con-

[1424-1487 A.D.]

sidering every single act of Albany's administration, however just it may have been in itself, as liable to be challenged and cut down, necessarily led, when attempted to be acted upon, to a stretch of power which bordered upon tyranny.

If we except his misguided desire to distinguish himself as a persecutor of the Wycliffites,¹ James' love for the church, as the best instrument he could employ in disseminating the blessings of education, and of general improvement throughout the country, was a wise and polite passion. He found his clergy a superior and enlightened class of men, and he employed their power, their wealth, and their abilities as a counterpoise to his nobility; yet he was not, like David I, a munificent founder of new religious houses; indeed, his income was so limited as to make this impossible.

It is well known that the personal accomplishments of this prince were of a high character. He was a reformer of the language and of the poetry of his country; he sang beautifully, and not only accompanied himself upon the harp and the organ, but composed various airs and pieces of sacred music, in which there was to be recognised the same original and inventive genius which distinguished this remarkable man in everything to which he applied his mind.

His great strength was shown in the dreadful and almost successful resistance which he made to his murderers. He died in the forty-fourth year of his age, and was buried in the church of the Carthusians at Perth, which he had himself founded. He left by his queen Joan an only son, James, his successor, then a boy in his seventh year, and five daughters. To two of these, Margaret, who became queen of France, and Eleanor, who married Sigismund, duke of Austria, their father transmitted his love of literature. James' remaining daughters were Isabella, married to Francis, duke of Bretagne; Mary who took as her husband the Count de Boncquan, son to the lord of Campvere; and lastly, Jane, wedded to the earl of Angus, and subsequently to the earl of Morton.

The story of the dauphiness and Alain Chartier is well known. Finding this famous poet asleep in the saloon of the palace, she stooped down and kissed him, observing to her ladies, who were somewhat astonished at the proceeding, that she did not kiss the man, but the mouth which had uttered so many fine things—a singular and, as they perhaps thought, too minute a distinction. Eleanor, although equally fond of literature, confined herself to a more decorous mode of exhibiting her predilection, by translating the romance of *Ponthus et Sidoyne* into German, for the amusement of her husband.²

THE MINORITY OF JAMES II; CRICHTON VS. LIVINGSTON (1487 A.D.)

Among the able men whom James I had called from comparative obscurity, the names of two statesmen appear, whom he had selected from the rank of the gentry, and raised to a high place in his councils. These were Sir William Crichton the chancellor, and Sir Alexander Livingston of Calder. Both were men of ancient family, though, descended probably of

[¹ Among the transactions of this reign, we ought not to omit to mention the fate of a heretic. James I is culpable for having permitted the death of Paul Crawar, a foreigner, and a follower of John Huss. He was tried by Laurence of Lindores, the same bigoted inquisitor who sat in judgment on Resby, whose fate this second martyr shared, at Saint Andrews, 1435. These instances prove that Scotland did not escape the ravages of intolerant superstition, though her history stands more free of such shocking cruelties than that of nations more important and more early civilised than herself.^d]

[1437-1439 A.D.]

Saxon parentage, they did not number among the greater nobles, who claimed, generally speaking, their birth from the Norman blood. Both, and more especially Crichton, had talents of a distinguished order, and were well qualified to serve the state. Unhappily, these two statesmen, upon whom the will of the late king, or the ordinance of a parliament called at Edinburgh immediately after James's murder, devolved the power of a joint regency, were enemies to each other, probably from ancient rivalry; and it was still more unfortunate that their talents were not united with corresponding virtues; for Livingston and Crichton appear to have been alike ambitious, cruel, and unscrupulous politicians. It is said by the Scots chronicles that the parliament assigned to Crichton the chancellor the administration of the kingdom, and to Livingston the care of the person of the young king.

It might have been supposed that the widowed queen Joan had some title to be comprised in the commission of regency, and there are indications that such had been the purpose of her husband; but alone, an English stranger, and a woman, after prosecuting the murderers of her husband to the death, she seems to have withdrawn herself from public affairs, and shortly afterwards married a man of rank, Sir James Stuart, who was called the Black Knight of Lorne—a union which, placing herself under tutelage, disqualified her from the office of regent, whether in her sole person or as an associate of Crichton and Livingston. About the same time, 1438, a nine years' truce with England put an end to the war which subsisted at the death of James I, and left the Scottish rulers at liberty to follow out without interruption their domestic dissensions.

Crichton and Livingston had a powerful opponent in the dreaded earl of Douglas; they were obliged to admit this mighty peer into the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom. This cause of alarm, common to them both, did not suppress their mutual hatred to each other. A minute account of enterprises which historians have left in great obscurity may be here excused; but the following facts are prominent.

THE "BLACK DINNER" (1439 A.D.)

Archibald, the fifth earl of Douglas, died in 1439, and was succeeded by his son William, a boy of fourteen years old, upon whom descended the various estates and dignities of that powerful family. The duchy of Touraine and lordship of Longueville in France seemed to give him the consequence of a foreign prince. In Scotland he enjoyed the earldom of Douglas, the lordships of Galloway and Annandale, and a wide extent both of property and influence throughout all the southern frontier. Repeatedly intermarried with the royal family itself, this mighty house had also formed matrimonial alliances with many of the most distinguished Scottish families. By bonds of dependence, or man-rent as they were called, almost all the principal gentry who lay in the neighbourhood of the wide domains of Douglas had become followers of the earl's banner, and his power, as far as it could be immediately and directly exercised, was equal to that of the king, his opulence perhaps superior.

Earl William, whose youth rendered him arrogant, made an imprudent display of the power which he possessed. His ordinary attendance consisted of a thousand horse, and he is said to have held *cours plenieres*, after the manner of parliaments, within his own jurisdictions, and to have dubbed knights with his own hand. The body of men who constantly attended on this young chief were many of them such as found their subsistence by bloodshed and

[1430-1444 A.D.]

pillage, who were always ready to interpose the name of their patron as a defence against punishment. The instances of oppression performed by the earl's followers, and the contempt and insult with which they rejected the attempts of the ordinary distributors of justice to bring them to punishment, were carefully noted down and laid to the charge of the young Douglas, whom Crichton was determined to make responsible for the mass of injuries which were committed in his name and by his followers. Under pretext of cultivating an intimacy between the young king and the earl of Douglas, whose years corresponded together, Earl William and his younger brother David were inveigled by the chancellor's flattery and fair speeches first to his castle of Crichton near Edinburgh, and then to the metropolis itself, where the two noble guests were lodged in the castle. Here, while they expected to be regaled at the royal table, a black bull's head, the signal of death, as it is reputed to have been in Scotland, was suddenly placed before them.¹ The astonished youths were dragged from the table by armed men, and subjected to a hasty trial, and in spite of the entreaties and prayers of the young king, they were cruelly beheaded. Malcolm Fleming of Cumbernauld, a friend and adherent of their family, shared the fate of the unfortunate boys. The whole might be well pronounced a murder committed with the sword of justice.

Unquestionably Livingston and Crichton, the authors of this detestable treason, reckoned on its effects in depressing the house of Douglas, and producing general quiet and good order. Another encouragement to the crime was the indolent and pacific disposition of James, called the Gross, the uncle of the murdered earl. This corpulent dignitary, whose fat is said to have weighed four stone, seems accordingly to have taken no measures whatever for avenging the death of his relatives.

James the Gross being removed by death within two years after the murder at Edinburgh Castle, was succeeded by his son William, a youth in the flower of his age, of as ardent ambition as any of his towering house, and filled with hatred against Crichton and Livingston for their share in his kinsmen's death. Thus did the power of Douglas revive in its most dangerous form within two years after the tragic execution in the castle of Edinburgh, and the political crime of Crichton and Livingston was, like many of the same dark complexion, committed in vain.

If we look at Scotland generally during this minority it forms a dark and disgusting spectacle. Feudal animosities were revived in all corners of the country; and the barriers of the law having been in a great measure removed, the land was drenched with the blood of its inhabitants, shed by their countrymen and neighbours.

In the midst of universal complaint, bloodshed, and confusion, the king was approaching his fourteenth year. He was easily persuaded, or brought to persuade himself, in 1444, that he could govern more effectively without the control of Crichton and Livingston, while the greater part of his subjects were at least satisfied that he could not rule worse than with the assistance of such unscrupulous counsellors. This produced a desire on the part both of the king and his subjects to dissolve the regency; and the earl of Douglas, trusting to find his own advantage, and the means of prosecuting his revenge against Crichton and Livingston, with more art than his house had usually manifested, resolved to make personal advances to gain the king's favour, and

¹ This circumstance staggers the belief of modern historians. The bull's head, used as the sign of death, is repeatedly mentioned in Highland tradition, and the custom may have been Celtic. [This atrocity was called the "Black Dinner" in popular memory.]

[1444-1448 A.D.]

prosecute his course to power rather as an ally and minister of the throne than the avowed rival and antagonist of the royal family.

He therefore came to court, submitted himself to the king's will, placed his person in the royal power without reserve, and personated so well the expressions and behaviour of a good subject, that James was delighted to find in the earl of Douglas, who had been represented as a formidable rival, a vassal so powerful at once and so humble. The king received him not into favour only, but into confidential trust and power, and with the assistance received from him easily succeeded in assuming the supreme authority into his own hands, and in displacing Livingston and Crichton, who had governed in James' name since his father's death.

In modern times, the dismissal of a ministry whose government has lasted long and assumed an absolute character, is usually followed by inquiries and impeachments: in the more ancient days, the ministers were called to account for their power by the terrors of a civil war. Livingston shut himself up in the castle of Stirling, and determined on resistance; the chancellor also garrisoned his castles, and stood upon his defence.

Sir William Crichton continued to hold out the castle of Edinburgh for nine weeks, and at last surrendered in 1446, on the most advantageous terms. He was confirmed in his honours, titles, and possessions; even his office of chancellor was restored to him. He seems to have formed an alliance with the earl of Douglas, and consented to take a share in his administration, surrendering at the same time to the earl's resentment Sir Alexander Livingston, the king's governor. This latter statesman was arrested, with many of his friends; and though his own grey hairs were spared, their ransom was dearly purchased by the decapitation of his two sons and the destruction of his family. He himself was imprisoned, and with his kinsmen Dundas, Bruce, and others, subjected to ruinous fines and penalties.

The earl of Douglas now attained the high dignity of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, and having the universal management of state affairs, failed not to use his influence for the advancement of the overswollen importance of his house. Three of his brothers were created peers. Archibald, by marrying with the heiress of the earl of Moray, succeeded to that title and estate; Hugh Douglas was made earl of Ormonde; and John, lord of Balveny.

Meantime the public tranquillity went to wreck on all hands. In the midst of this almost universal turmoil we may notice the death of Joan, the queen-mother, who hardly obtained permission to die in safety in the castle of Dunbar, that of Hailes being stormed and taken for having afforded her temporary refuge. Her second husband, the Black Knight of Lorne, having uttered some words reflecting on the administration of the earl of Douglas, saw himself compelled to leave Scotland. His misfortunes continued to attend him; the bark on which he sailed for France was taken by a Flemish corsair, and he died shortly after in a species of captivity.

In the mean time the earl of Douglas, who possessed the warlike character of his ancestors, defended the country against its external enemies with better success than that with which he maintained domestic tranquillity. The borderers, partaking the spirit of the unsettled times, had broken through the truce by incursions on both sides; and the discordant administrations of Henry VI and James II, who strongly resembled each other in point of cabal and internal dissension, found that the two countries were at war, even without either government intending it. On the one side, Dumfries was burned by young Percy and Robert Ogle; on the other, Lord Balveny, the youngest brother of Douglas, gave the town of Alnwick to the flames.

[1448-1450 A.D.]

To make a deeper impression on the hostile country, the earl of Huntingdon and Lord Percy crossed the western marches with about fifteen thousand men. They were met by Douglas at the head of a much inferior army, who either defeated or compelled them to retire. This foil only animated the English to a stronger effort. They assembled an army amounting to twenty thousand men. They crossed the river Sark at low water in 1448, and found themselves in front of the Scottish force, under command of Hugh, earl of Ormonde, another brother of the Douglas family. The Scots pressed furiously forward, and the English gave way. The river Sark, now augmented by the returning tide, lay in the rear of the fugitive army: many were drowned in the attempt to cross it. The English army lost three thousand men, and the young Lord Percy and Sir John Pennington were made prisoners.

The truce was shortly after again renewed, in 1449, by the English; and in the treaty on the occasion both parties disowned having been the cause of its being broken. About the same period the interest of the earl of Douglas at the Scottish court began to decline.

Sir William Crichton also began to recover the king's confidence, and his proved policy was employed in the honourable commission of renewing the old alliance with France, and seeking out upon the continent a befitting match for the king. The election fell on Mary of Guelders, with whom Philip of Burgundy agreed to give 60,000 crowns of gold as the portion of his kinswoman, who had been educated at his court. The alliance with France was renewed, and one with Burgundy was entered into. The success of Sir William Crichton in this negotiation, and the acceptable selection of his bride, raised the old statesman still higher in James' favour; and as he acquired the royal confidence, he had further opportunities of instilling into the sovereign's mind the rules of policy on which his father, James I, had acted, with a view of raising the power of the crown and depressing the feudal greatness of the nobility. These instructions were necessarily unfavourable to Douglas.

A parliament was held at Edinburgh in 1450, providing for the restoration of the progresses of the justiciary courts, which had been interrupted, and denouncing the penalties of rebellion against all persons who should presume to make private war on the king's subjects, declaring that the whole force of the country should be led against them if necessary. Severe laws were made against spoilers and marauders, and regulations laid down that the nobility should travel with moderate trains, to avoid oppressing the country. Finally, a statute was passed imposing the pains of treason on any who should aid or supply with help or counsel those who were traitors to the king's person, or who should garrison houses in their defence, or aid such rebels in the assault of castles or other places where the king's person should happen to be for the time. The tendency of these laws shows the predominant evils which had taken root during the king's minority, and the remedies by which, when come to man's estate, James II proceeded to attempt a cure.

THE KING CRUSHES THE POWER OF THE DOUGLAS

The earl of Douglas, finding his court favour upon the wane, began to withdraw himself from the king's, and, in despite of the laws which had been so lately enacted, to play the independent prince in his own country, which comprehended all the borders and great part of the west of Scotland. In 1450 the earl of Douglas undertook a pilgrimage to Rome, which he performed magnificently, with a retinue of six knights, fourteen gentlemen, and eighty attendants of inferior rank. He was received at Paris with the honour due

[1450-1455 A.D.]

to his high family and the memory of his ancestor who fell at Verneuil in the French service. Even at Rome the name of Douglas was respected, and the rude magnificence of the earl who bore it attracted attention and regard.

While Douglas was absent on his pilgrimage his vassals continued to be disorderly and insubordinate as before. Symington, the earl's bailiff in Douglasdale, was cited to answer for the conduct of such malefactors, but contumaciously refused to obey. Upon this, William Sinclair, earl of Orkney, then chancellor of Scotland, was sent to levy distress on the rents and goods of the earl of Douglas, to satisfy those who complained of injury from his tenants. The chancellor's mission met with no success, for he was received only with resistance and insult. The king, incensed at this contumacy offered to the highest law-officer in the realm, marched in person into the disobedient districts, ravaged Douglas' estates, and took possession of the castles of Lochmaberry and Douglas, the last of which he razed to the ground.

When the evil tidings reached Rome, they struck such alarm into the minds of Douglas' attendants that several relinquished their dependence on the earl and left him. He himself hastened homewards, and used his influence upon such men of consequence as lived in those countries over which he had authority, to compel them, though diametrically contrary to law, to execute leagues and bonds, by which they engaged themselves to support each other, and to make common cause with the Douglas against all mortals besides. Those who declined to comply with Douglas' pleasure in this matter were sure, more or less directly, to feel the force of his vengeance, which a wide authority over the border countries, filled with strong clans of habitual marauders, enabled him to accomplish, without the earl himself appearing active in the matter.^d

By forming the league with the earl of Crawford and other barons, he had united against his sovereign almost one-half of his kingdom. But his credulity led him into the same snare which had been fatal to the former earl. Relying on the king's promises, who had now attained to the years of manhood, and having obtained a safe-conduct under the great seal, he ventured to meet him in Stirling Castle. James urged him to dissolve that dangerous confederacy into which he had entered; the earl obstinately refused. "If you will not," said the enraged monarch, drawing his dagger, "this shall," and stabbed him to the heart.

An action so unworthy of a king filled the nation with astonishment and with horror. The earl's vassals ran to arms with the utmost fury, and dragging the safe-conduct, which the king had granted and violated, at a horse's tail, they marched towards Stirling, burned the town, and threatened to besiege the castle. An accommodation, however, ensued, on what terms is not known. But the king's jealousy, and the new earl's power and resentment, prevented it from being of long continuance. Both took the field at the head of their armies in March, 1455, and met near Abercorn. That of the earl, composed chiefly of borderers, was far superior to the king's, both in number and in valour; and a single battle must, in all probability, have decided whether the house of Stuart or of Douglas was henceforth to possess the throne of Scotland. But while his troops impatiently expected the signal to engage, the earl ordered them to retire to their camp; and Sir James Hamilton of Cadzow, the person in whom he placed the greatest confidence, convinced of his want of genius to improve an opportunity, or of his want of courage to seize a crown, deserted him that very night.^e

[^d Hume Brown * notes that this story of the meeting of the two armies as told by Boece/ has no contemporary support.]

The example was contagious, for the character of Hamilton for prudence and sagacity stood very high. The army of insurgents dissolved like a snow-wreath in a sudden thaw.

The secession of Hamilton to the royal cause was deservedly regarded as excellent service. He was, for appearance' sake, put in ward for a while at Roslin, under the charge of the earl of Orkney. But the king's favour was shown to him by large grants of forfeited estates, and by the title of lord of parliament, which raised first to nobility the great ducal house of Hamilton.

The earl of Douglas broke up his camp and withdrew with his diminished squadrons to take refuge in the wildest districts of the border, where they lurked as exiles and fugitives in the countries which they had lately commanded with sovereign power. The castle of Abercorn, despairing of relief, soon surrendered, and of the defenders some principal persons were put to death for holding out the place against the king. James II proceeded to march his army through the west and south of Scotland, where his powerful opponents had lately been proprietors of the soil, and leaders, if not tyrants, of the people, and with slight resistance reduced all the strong places of the Douglases to his own authority. Douglas Castle itself, that of Strathaven, and that of the Thrieve, were in this manner taken and demolished.

About the same time, and while the king was making his triumphant progress, Douglas himself fled into England with a very few attendants. His three brothers, Moray, Ormonde, and Balveny, remained on the borders at the head of the remains of the followers of their family, and maintained them by military license. A conflict took place at Arkinholm, near Langholm, where the bands of Douglas were totally defeated by border clans, May 1st, 1455. The earl of Moray was slain; the earl of Ormonde taken prisoner, condemned, and executed; and of the brethren of Douglas the lord Balveny alone escaped into England.

The history of this the last of the original branch of the Douglas family may as well be terminated here. Having during his prosperity maintained a close intercourse with the house of York, who were then in power, Douglas was hospitably received in England. In the year 1483 he, with the duke of Albany, then a banished noble like himself, made an incursion into Scotland, having vowed they would make their offer on the high altar of Lochmaberry upon Saint Magdalen's day. The west border men rose to repel the incursion. The exiles were defeated, and the earl of Douglas struck from his horse. Surrounded by enemies, and seeing on the field a son of Kirkpatrick of Closeburn, once his own follower, the earl surrendered himself to him in preference to others, that, as an old friend, he might profit by the reward set upon his head. Kirkpatrick wept to see the extremity to which his old master was reduced, and offered to set him at liberty and fly with him into England. But Douglas, weary of exile, was resigned to his fate. When the aged prisoner came before the king, James II commanded him to be put into the cloister at Lindores. The earl only replied, "He that may no better must be a monk." He assumed the tonsure accordingly, and died about 1488.

Thus, after an obscure conflict with those who had been so lately its dependents, fell, and for ever, the formidable power of the house of Douglas, which had so lately measured itself against that of monarchy. It can only be compared to the gourd of the prophet, which, spreading with such miraculous luxuriance, was withered in a single night. The indecision and imbecility of Earl James, who did not chance to possess the qualities of military skill and political wisdom which had seemed till his time almost hereditary in this great family, appear to have been the immediate cause of their de-

[1455 A.D.]

struction. But there was moral justice in the lesson, that a house raised to power by the inappreciable services and inflexible loyalty of the good Lord James and his successors should fall by the irregular ambition and treasonable practices of its later chiefs.^d

James did not suffer this favourable interval to pass unimproved; he procured the consent of a parliament, called at Edinburgh, to laws more advantageous to the prerogative, and more subversive of the privileges of the aristocracy, than were ever obtained by any former or subsequent monarch of Scotland. By one of these, not only all the vast possessions of the earl of Douglas were annexed to the crown, but all prior and future alienations of crown lands were declared to be void, and the king was empowered to seize them at pleasure without any process or form of law, and oblige the possessors to refund whatever they had received from them. A dreadful instrument of oppression in the hands of a prince!

Another law prohibited the wardenship of the marches to be granted hereditarily; restrained, in several instances, the jurisdiction of that office; and extended the authority of the king's courts. By a third it was enacted that no regality or exclusive right of administering justice within a man's own lands should be granted in time to come without the consent of parliament; a condition which implied almost an express prohibition. Those nobles who already possessed that great privilege would naturally be solicitous to prevent it from becoming common by being bestowed on many. Those who had not themselves attained it would envy others the acquisition of such a flattering distinction, and both would concur in rejecting the claims of new pretenders.

By a fourth act, all new grants of hereditary offices were prohibited, and those obtained since the death of the last king were revoked. Each of these statutes undermined some of the great pillars on which the power of the aristocracy rested.^e

LAST YEARS AND DEATH OF JAMES II (1459-1460 A.D.)

Yet, though the policy of retaining these forfeitures in the crown was distinctly seen, it could not in prudence be invariably acted upon. The king had no other means of rewarding the services of the loyal chiefs who had stood by the crown in the last struggle than by grants out of the estates of the traitors; and the lands of the Douglas family, large as they were, were inadequate to satisfy the numerous expectants. The chief of these was the earl of Angus, a large and flourishing branch of the Douglas, sprung from a second son of the earl of the principal family. The present Angus had been a loyalist during his kinsman's usurpation, which, from the difference of the family complexion, led to a popular saying that the Red Douglas had put down the Black. The earl of Angus was rewarded with a grant of Douglas Castle with its valley and domains, of Tantallon Castle, and other large portions of the ancient estates of the Douglas family; an imprudent profusion, it must be allowed, since it served to raise this younger branch to a height not much less formidable to the crown than that which the original Douglases had attained. Gordon, in the north, was not forgotten; and the southern chieftains profiting largely by the forfeiture of the Douglases, easily obtained gifts of considerable possessions which no one but they themselves could have occupied with safety. In a word, if the king distinctly saw the policy of enriching the crown, which the statutes of his reign imply, it is as certain he found it impossible to follow the maxim rigidly

without restricting the necessary bounty to his adherents. It was no time to lose men's hearts for lack of liberality; for the ashes of the civil hostility were still glowing in the remoter districts of Scotland.

A war with England was the next object of interest during the active reign of James II. He invaded England in 1459 with six thousand men, burned and plundered the country for twenty miles inland, and destroyed eighteen towers and fortalices. The Scottish army remained on English ground six days, without battle being offered, and returned home without loss, and with worship and honour. On James' retreat, the duke of York and earl Salisbury, with other English nobles, led to the border a body of about four or five thousand men; but having differed in opinion of the plan of the campaign, they quarrelled among themselves and retired with disgrace. The cause of these internal discords in the English camp probably arose out of the dissensions concerning the red and white roses, which were now engrossing the nation. The truce with England was prolonged for nine years. James, however, seems to have deemed the period favourable for recovering such Scottish possessions as were still held by the English; accordingly we find him breaking through the truce.

It was with this view that the king collected a numerous army, and laid siege to Roxburgh, which had now been in possession of the English since the captivity of David II, and, as a military post, was of the greatest importance, being very strongly situated between the Tweed and Teviot, and not far from their confluence, in the most fertile part of the Scottish frontier. John, the lord of the Isles, appeared in the royal camp, to atone for former errors and treasonable actions in 1451 by zeal on the present occasion. James beleaguered the castle on every side. He was proud of his train of cannon, and of the skill of a French engineer, who could level them so truly as to hit within a fathom of the place he aimed at, which, in these days, was held extraordinary practice.

Unhappily, on Sunday, August 3rd, 1460, standing in the vicinity of a gun which was about to be discharged, the rude mass, composed of ribs of iron bound together by hoops of the same metal, burst asunder, and a fragment striking the king on the thigh, broke it asunder, and killed him on the spot. The earl of Angus was severely wounded on the same occasion.

Thus fell James II of Scotland in the twenty-ninth year of his age, and the twenty-fourth of his reign. His person was strong and well put together, and he was reckoned excellent at all exercises. His face would have been handsome, had it not been partly disfigured by a red spot, which procured him from his subjects the name of "James with the Fiery Face." Of the natural violence of his temper he had given an unfortunate proof, by suffering himself to be surprised into a violation of faith towards Douglas. His subjects seem, however, to have considered this as the act of momentary passion; and James' clemency to Crawford, who, in the words of the chronicler, had been "right dangerous to the king," after that earl was entirely in his power, as well as the small number of persons who suffered for rebellions which shook the very throne, made his temper appear merciful compared to that of his father, James I. He possessed the gift of being able to choose wise counsellors, and had the sense to follow their advice when chosen. In the display which James II was called on to make of his military talents he showed both courage and conduct. His death was an inexpressible loss to his country, which was again plunged into the miseries of a long minority.^a

Hume Brown^k notes the remarkable coincidence of great events during the period of James II's reign. The end of the hundred years' war shut Eng-

[1460-1463 A.D.]

land out of France forever, and consolidated French nationality. In Florence the Medici rose to power. In the East Constantinople fell to the Mohammedans. He notes also a minor parallel to the wars of Lancaster and York in the feud of the Stuart and the Douglas and thinks that lawless as Scotland was at this time, it was in no worse state than England or France.^a

James II left three sons: James, his successor; Alexander, duke of Albany, and John, who was created earl of Mar; with two daughters, Mary and Margaret, of whom we shall have occasion to say more hereafter.^d

MARY OF GUELTERS AND BISHOP KENNEDY IN CONTROL

The sudden death of James II struck such a damp into the Scottish nobles that they were about to abandon the siege of Roxburgh, and break up their camp, when the courage of Mary of Guelders, the widowed queen, reanimated their spirits. She arrived in the camp almost immediately after the king's death, and throwing herself and her son [now about nine years old], their infant sovereign, upon the faith of the Scottish lords, conjured them never to remove the siege from this ill-fated castle till they had laid it in ruins. The nobles caught fire at her exhortations. They crowned their king at the neighbouring abbey of Kelso, August 10th, 1460, with such ceremonies of homage and royalty as the time admitted, and, pressing the siege with double vigour, compelled the English garrison to surrender on terms. The castle of Roxburgh they levelled to the ground, agreeably to the policy recommended by Robert Bruce. [They also invaded England and destroyed the castle of Wark.]

The queen regent naturally retained a considerable influence in the government, and seems to have acted for some time as regent, with the assistance of a council of state. Her conduct, however, which was not personally respectable, considerably diminished her influence before her death, which took place when she was in the full vigour of life. Kennedy, archbishop of Saint Andrews, the wise and loyal friend of his father, became the personal guardian of the infant king.^d

Hume Brown^k calls James Kennedy "a name of happy omen in Scottish history," since he had aided James II materially in crushing the Douglas family. A recently discovered letter from Kennedy to Louis XI, published by Wavrin,^l has re-established the statement by Buchanan,^m which Pinkerton,ⁿ Tytler,^c and others branded as fables, that after James II's death there rose a bitter feud between Mary of Guelders and Kennedy over the wars of Lancaster and York; and that while Kennedy favoured Henry VI, Mary was so strongly in favour of the house of York that civil war was almost precipitated. She had at first sided with the Lancastrians, the marriage of her daughter Mary with Prince Edward was broached, and Margaret of Anjou and her son Edward were entertained in Scotland by Mary; but the Yorkists brought the influence of Philip of Burgundy to bear upon Mary, who was his niece, and she set herself in opposition to Kennedy and the Lancastrians. It was even proposed by the earl of Warwick that Mary should marry the English king Edward IV, who had driven Henry VI to exile in Scotland. Edward also intrigued with the exiled earl of Douglas and with John earl of Ross and lord of the Isles, and assigned to the latter and to Donald Balloch all the country north of the Forth, which John at once assumed to rule.

In 1463, however, Douglas was defeated on one of his raids, the earl of Angus, the chief Lancastrian supporter, died, and December 1st, 1463, Mary

[1464-1469 A.D.]

of Guelders also died at the age of about thirty. This threw the power into the hands of the Yorkists, and Kennedy became the practical ruler. But he preserved the truce with Edward IV which had been arranged in 1463, and renewed it for fourteen years June 3rd, 1464.

Kennedy died, probably in July, 1465. He is rated as one of the great Catholic churchmen in Scottish history, and Major^o said of him "Among our fellow countrymen I have found none who have done more signal public service than this prelate."

In the vacant place of Kennedy, there now rose a strange alliance of three men who made a bond of union February 10th, 1466, for mutual support in all exigencies, and for the control of the king and of patronage. These three were the lords Fleming and Kennedy (brother of the bishop), and Sir Alexander Boyd (brother of Lord Robert Boyd). Fleming asked only for the patronage, and any "large thing such as ward, relief, marriage, or office" falling to the crown was to be given to him in return for his leaving the young king in the power of the other two.

July 9th, 1466, the confederates kidnapped the king and took him to Edinburgh, where a parliament was summoned October 9th, and Boyd went through a farce of begging the king to confess that his removal from Linlithgow was at his own wish. The king so declared and appointed Boyd his guardian. The other members of the family now made large seizures of property, and Lord Robert Boyd's eldest son Thomas was in 1467 made earl of Arran and married to the king's sister Mary.^a

THE ACQUISITION OF THE ORKNEY AND SHETLAND ISLANDS (1469 A.D.)

An important acquisition to the Scottish dominions was effected in this reign, feeble as it was. The Orkney Islands had as yet remained part of the Norwegian dominions, having been seized by that people in the ninth century. A large sum of money was due from Scotland to Denmark, being the arrears of the annual, as it was called, of Norway. This was the annuity of 100 marks, due to Norway as the consideration for the cession of the Hebrides, or Western Isles, settled by the treaty of 1264, entered into after Hakon's defeat at the battle of Largs. James I had obtained some settlement respecting this annuity; but it had been again permitted to fall into arrears, and the amount of the debt had become uncertain.

Under the influence of Charles VII of France there had been negotiations between Denmark and Scotland for the final arrangement of these claims, which were renewed in 1468. Boyd, the young earl of Arran, seems to have managed this treaty with considerable dexterity. It was finally agreed that James III should wed Margaret, a daughter of the king of Denmark, whom her father proposed to endow with a portion of 60,000 florins, of which 10,000 only were to be paid in ready money, and for security of the remainder the islands of Orkney were to be assigned in pledge. In addition to this, Denmark renounced all claim to the arrears of the annuity payable on account of the cession of the Hebrides, which seem to have been given up as an old, prescribed, and somewhat desperate claim. When the term for payment of the 10,000 florins arrived, Christian of Denmark found himself so short of money that he could only produce the fifth part of the sum, and for the rest an assignment of security over the archipelago of Shetland was offered and gladly accepted. Thus Scotland acquired a right of mortgage to the whole of these islands, constituting the ancient Thule, so important to her in every

[1469-1474 A.D.]

point of view, and which, as we shall hereafter see, the crown of Denmark was never able to redeem.

While the earl of Arran was negotiating this national treaty, his influence with the king was undermined by those courtiers who envied his sudden elevation and the preference which James had displayed towards him and his family. When the earl arrived in the firth of Forth with the fleet which escorted the Danish princess to the shores where she was to reign, Arran's wife, the princess Mary, came on board to acquaint him that if he landed his life would be in danger. They fled together, therefore; and the new earl of Arran returned to Denmark, to seek refuge from the indignation of his fickle prince, for whom he had so lately achieved, in the same kingdom, such important negotiations. In the mean time the total ruin of his friends at home took place, almost without opposition, and the power of the house of Boyd was destroyed as speedily as it arose. It is vain to inquire why a weak prince should be as changeable as he was violent in his partialities.

Sentence of high treason was passed upon the Boyds for their aggression in 1466, though fully pardoned by a subsequent parliament. Sir Alexander Boyd suffered death; the lord Boyd escaped to England, where he died in poverty. The earl of Arran, who appears by his personal qualities to have merited the confidence which the king had so suddenly withdrawn, seems to have received but a cold welcome in Denmark. The princess Mary was separated from him and sent back to Scotland, on the demand, it may be presumed, of her royal brother; and her unfortunate husband, after wandering as an exile from one country to another, died, it is said, in Flanders. His death, or a divorce between him and the princess Mary obtained by the influence of James, gave an opportunity for forming a second marriage betwixt the king's sister and the Lord Hamilton,¹ the heir of a family which had been rising in influence and importance ever since the first lord of the name so opportunely embraced the cause of the king, in the grand struggle of James II with the house of Douglas. The princess had a family by both marriages; but Boyd's son and daughter died without heirs; while her son by Hamilton survived, so that in Queen Mary's time their descendant stood first in succession to the crown.

TREATY WITH ENGLAND (1474 A.D.)

In the parliament of 1469, held after the fall of the Boyds, we see the good sense of the people of Scotland displayed in an act declaring that every homicide who flees to sanctuary shall be taken forth and put to the judgment of an assize; "for to such manslaughterers of forethought felony," said the statute, "the law will not grant the immunity of the church."

The sceptre of France was now swayed by Louis XI, one of the most wise of princes and most worthless of men. He was aware of the importance of the Scottish league to the safety of France, as affording a ready means of annoyance against England. Edward IV of England became, on the other hand, sensible that it was better to acquire, if possible, the goodwill of his northern neighbours by friendly means, and thus secure his frontier at home. By a treaty entered into in 1474, it was agreed, that, in order to promote the mutual happiness, honour, and interest of this noble island, called Great Britain, a contract of marriage should be executed betwixt the prince of Scotland and

[¹ In the union which he thus eagerly pressed, James little dreamed what trouble he was preparing for one of his descendants. From this second marriage sprung that claim of the Hamiltons which was a permanent source of disturbance throughout the reign of Mary Stuart. —HUME BROWN.⁴]

[1474-1478 A.D.]

Cecilia, daughter of the king of England, the former being only two, the latter four years old. A portion of 20,000 marks sterling was to be paid by annual instalments of 2,000 marks, to commence with the date of the contract. If the prince or princess named in the contract should die, it was agreed that another of the royal family to which the deceased party might belong should fill up his or her place in the contract. If such marriage did not take place, Scotland became bound to repay the sum of money advanced in manner aforesaid, under the deduction of 2,500 marks, which Edward agreed to abandon as a consideration paid for the friendship of Scotland at a critical period. By the same treaty the long truce of fifty-five years was affirmed and secured.

Edward IV was, however, too impetuous and too necessitous to continue long this expensive though secure course of policy. Three years' instalments of the proposed portion were paid with regularity; but Edward in the course of 1478 conceived he stood so well with France as might enable him to dispense with the expensive friendship of Scotland.

In the same year in which the treaty of marriage with England was fixed upon, the counsellors of James III resolved to proceed to check the power of John, lord of the Isles and titular earl of Ross, whose insubordination again had merited chastisement. After a show of resistance the island lord submitted himself [July 15th, 1476], and by an act of parliament was finally deprived of the earldom of Ross, which was annexed inalienably to the crown, with liberty to the kings to convey it as an appanage to their younger sons, but to no meaner subject.

James III had now attained his twenty-fifth year under circumstances of success which had attended no Scottish monarch since Robert Bruce. His kingdom was strengthened by the expulsion of the English from Roxburgh Castle and the town of Berwick, as well as by the acquisition of the Orkney and Shetland islands, the natural dependencies of Scotland. The country was relieved of the charge of the Norway annual, a burden it was incapable of discharging, and the increasing consequence of the nation was manifested by the contending offers of France and England for her favour and friendship. All these advantages indicate that James had, at this period of his reign, able ministers, by whom his counsels were directed. The chief of these probably was the chancellor, Andrew Stuart, Lord Evandale, whose importance was now so great that, in virtue of his office, he took rank next to the princes of the blood royal. He was a natural son of Sir James Stuart, son of Murdoch, duke of Albany.

In the mean time the unfortunate James began to disclose evil qualities and habits which his youth had hitherto concealed from observation. He had a dislike to the active sports of hunting and the games of chivalry, mounted on horseback rarely, and rode ill. A consciousness of these deficiencies, in what were the most approved accomplishments of the age, and a certain shyness which attends a timorous temper, rendered the king alike unfit and unwilling to mingle in the pleasures of his nobility, or to show himself to his subjects in the romantic pageants which were the delight of the age. James' amusements were of a character in which neither his peers nor people could share, and though to a certain extent they were innocent, and even honourable, they were yet such as, pushed to excess, must have necessarily interfered with the regular discharge of his royal duties. He was attached to what are now called the fine arts of architecture and music; and in studying these used the instructions of William Roger, an English musician, Thomas Cochrane, a mason or architect, and William Torphichen, a dancing-master. Another

[1478-1479 A.D.]

of his domestic minions was Hommli [or Hommyle], a tailor, not the least important in the conclave, if we may judge from the variety and extent of the royal wardrobe, of which a voluminous catalogue is preserved.

JAMES' ENMITY TO HIS BROTHERS

The nation with disgust and displeasure saw the king disuse the society of the Scottish nobles, and abstain from their counsel, to lavish favours upon and be guided by the advice of a few whom the age termed base mechanics. In this situation, the public eye was fixed upon James' younger brothers, Alexander, duke of Albany, and John, earl of Mar. These princes were remarkable for the royal qualities which the king did not possess. Being naturally drawn into comparison with their brother, and extolled above him by the public voice, James seems to have become jealous of them, even on account of their possessing the virtues or endowments which he himself was conscious of wanting. It is too consonant with the practice of courts to suppose that Mar and Albany were not quiescent under this dishonourable suspicion and jealousy. It is probable that they intrigued with the other discontented nobles; with what purpose, or to what extent, cannot now be ascertained. Mar was accused of having inquired of pretended witches concerning the term of the king's life; a suspicious subject of inquiry, considering it was made by so near a relation; and the progress of Albany's life shows him capable of unscrupulous ambition.

The king, on his part, resorted to diviners and soothsayers to know his own future fate; and the answer (probably dictated by the favourite Cochrane) was, that he should fall by the means of his nearest of kin. The unhappy monarch, with a self-contradiction, one of the many implied in superstition, imagined that his brothers were the relations indicated by the oracle; and also imagined that his knowledge of their intentions might enable him to alter the supposed doom of fate. Albany and Mar were suddenly arrested, as the king's suspicions grew darker and more dangerous; and while the duke was confined in the castle of Edinburgh, Mar was committed to that of Craigmillar. Conscious, probably, that the king possessed matter which might afford a pretext to take his life, Albany resolved on his escape. He communicated his scheme to a faithful attendant, by whose assistance he intoxicated, or, as some accounts say, murdered the captain of the guard, and then attempted to descend from the battlements of the castle by a rope. His attendant made the essay first; but the rope being too short, he fell and broke his thigh-bone. The duke, warned by this accident, lengthened the rope with the sheets from his bed, and made the perilous descent in safety. He transported his faithful attendant on his back to a place of security, then was received on board a vessel which lay in the roads of Leith, and set sail for France, where he met a hospitable reception, and was maintained by the bounty of Louis XI.

Enraged at the escape of the elder of his captives, it would seem that James was determined to make secure of Mar, who remained. There occur no records to show that the unfortunate prince was subjected to any public trial: nor can it be known, save by conjecture, how far James III was accessory to the perpetration of his murder, which was said to be executed by bleeding the prisoner to death in a bath.¹ Several persons were at the same time condemned and executed for acts of witchcraft, charged as having been practised, at Mar's instance, against the life of the king.

[¹ Hume Brown thinks that the earl of Mar was not murdered, but died in prison.]

THE REBELLION OF ALBANY AND THE ENGLISH WAR (1483 A.D.)

About this time war broke out between the two sister countries of Britain, after an interval of peace of unusual duration. The blame may have originally lain with England, who had violated the articles of the last treaty, in discontinuing the stipulated payment of the princess Cecilia's portion; but the incursions of the Scots gave the first signal for actual hostilities. Wise regulations were laid down by the Scottish parliament [met at Edinburgh March 13th, 1482] for garrisoning, with hired soldiers, Berwick, the Hermitage castle, and other fortresses on the border, the expense to be defrayed from the public revenue. If Edward IV, who is discourteously termed the robber ["the revare, Edward, calland himself king of England"], should invade Scotland, it was appointed that the king should take the field, and that the whole nobles and commons should live or die with him. Edward IV on his part, desirous to obtain an advantage similar to that which had been gained by Edward I and Edward III, by means of the Baliol's claim to the Scottish throne, made proposals to the banished duke of Albany that he should set himself up as a competitor for his brother's throne. Whatever had been the specious virtue of Albany, it was of a kind easily seduced by temptation, and, like Baliol in similar circumstances, he hastened from France over to England, agreed to become king of Scotland under the patronage of Edward,¹ consented to resign the long-disputed question of the independence of his country, promised the abandonment of Berwick and other places on the border, and undertook to restore to his estate the banished earl of Douglas, who was to be a party in the projected invasion. Under this agreement, which was, however, kept strictly secret, the celebrated duke of Gloucester, afterwards King Richard III, was detached to the Scottish wars at the head of a considerable army, and Albany accompanied him.

The Scottish king had in the mean time assembled his army and set forward against the enemy. But there existed a spirit of disaffection among his nobility, which led to an unexpected explosion. Cochrane, the mason, the most able, or at least the most bold, of the king's plebeian favourites, had made so much money by accepting of bribes and selling his interest in the king's favour, that he was able to purchase from his master, James—who added avarice to the other vices of a grovelling and degraded spirit—the earldom of Mar. The insatiable extortioner amassed money by indirect means of every kind; and one mode which particularly affected the poor was the debasement of the coin of the realm, by mixing the silver with so much copper as entirely to destroy its value. This adulterated coin was called the "Cochrane-plack," and was so favourite a speculation of his that, having been told it would be one day called in, he answered scornfully, "Yes, on the day I am hanged," an unwitting prophecy, which was punctually accomplished.

The rank and state affected by the new earl of Mar only more deeply incensed the nobility, who considered their order as disgraced by the introduction of such a person. A band of three hundred men constantly attended the favourite, armed with battle-axes, and displaying his livery of white with black fillets. He himself used to appear in a riding suit of black velvet, his horn mounted with gold, and hung around his neck by a chain of the same metal. In this manner he joined the Scottish host.

The army had advanced from the capital as far as Lauder, when the

[¹ By the treaty of Fotheringay, 1482, he agreed to call himself "Alexander, king of Scotland by the gyfte of the king of England."]

[1489 A.D.]

nobility, beginning to feel sensible of their power in a camp consisting chiefly of their own soldiers and feudal followers, resolved that they would meet together, and consult what measures were to be taken for the reform of the abuses of the commonwealth, having already in vain represented their grievances to the king.

The armed conclave was held in Lauder church, where, in the course of their deliberations, Lord Gray reminded them of the fable in which the mice are said to have laid a project for preventing the future ravages of the cat by tying a bell around her neck, which might make them aware of her approach. "An excellent proposal," said the orator, "but which fell unexpectedly to the ground, because none of the mice had courage enough to fasten the bell on the cat's neck." "I will bell the cat!" exclaimed Douglas, earl of Angus; from which he was ever afterwards called by the homely appellation of Archibald Bell-the-Cat. It was agreed that the king's favourites should be seized and put to death, and the king himself should be placed under some gentle restraint, until he should give satisfactory assurance of a change of measures.

One or two, deemed the most grave of the nobles, undertook to acquaint the king with their purpose; while the others, seizing the minions who were the objects of their violence, caused them to be hanged over the bridge of Lauder. Cochrane, when brought to the place of execution, showed how much a paltry love of show made part of his character. He made it his suit to be hanged in a silken cord, and offered to supply it from his own pavilion. This idle request only taught his stern auditors how to wound his feelings more deeply. "Thou shalt die," they said, "like a mean slave as thou art," and applied to the purpose of his execution a halter of horse-hair, as the most degrading means of death which they could invent. This execution was done with excessive applause on the part of the army. All the favourites of the weak prince perished, except [the tailor Hommyle, and] a youth called Ramsay of Balmain, who clung close to the king's person: James begged his life with so much earnestness, that the peers relented, and granted their sovereign's boon.

The consequences of this enterprise are very puzzling to the historian. The Scottish nobility seem to have retired with the determination not to oppose the English host in arms, expecting, probably, that they would be able to settle some accommodation by means of the duke of Albany. They were as yet ignorant of the disgraceful treaty which he had made with England, and hoped to have the advantage of his talents as a regent to direct the weak councils of his brother James. In the mean time they subjected the king to a mitigated imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle. It would seem that Albany, perceiving the Scottish nobles totally indisposed to admit his claim to the kingdom, was willing enough to accept the proposal of becoming lieutenant-general. That he might do so with the better grace Albany and the duke of Gloucester interceded with the Scottish lords for the liberation of the king. The nobles addressed the duke of Albany with much respect, and agreed to grant whatever he desired, acknowledging him to be, after James' children, the nearest of blood to the royal family. "But for that person who accompanies you," they continued, in allusion to the English prince, "we know nothing of him whatever, or by what right he presumes to talk to us upon our national affairs, and will pay no deference to his wishes, seeing he is entitled to none."

The English, however, gained one important advantage upon this occasion. The town of Berwick, which had been delivered up to the Scots by Henry VI, and possessed by them for nearly twenty years, was taken, August

[1483-1486 A.D.]

24th, 1482, by the troops of Richard of Gloucester, and the castle being also yielded, this strong fortress and valuable sea-port never afterwards returned to the dominion of Scotland. In other respects the English sought no national advantage by the pacification.

James was in this manner restored to his liberty, and, either from fickleness of temper or profound dissimulation, appeared for a time to be so much attached to Albany, that he could not be separated from him for a moment. The concord of the royal brethren showed itself by some demonstrations which would seem strange at the present day. They rode together, on one occasion mounted on the same horse, from the castle of Edinburgh, along the principal street, down to the abbey of Holyrood, to the great joy and delectation of all good subjects. Every night, also, according to Ferrerius,² the king and Albany partook the same bed.

But this fraternal concord, which must have had from the beginning its source in a degree of affectation, did not long continue; and the predominant disposition of each prince disconcerted their union. The ambition of Albany would have alarmed the fears of a less timorous or suspicious man than James. It appears too plainly that the duke resumed his treasonable practices with the court of England [in a treaty dated February 11th, 1483], and it would seem that his intrigues were discovered, and that the greater part of the Scottish nobles, incensed at his perfidy, joined in expelling him from the government. [By a parliament which met June 27th, 1484] doom of forfeiture was pronounced against Albany, and he fled to England, having first, as the last act of treachery in his power, delivered up his castle of Dunbar to an English garrison, and thus, in so far as in him lay, exposed the frontiers of which he was the warden. The next year witnessed the battle of Lochmaberry, the event of a foray undertaken by Douglas and Albany into Annandale, in which Douglas was made prisoner,¹ and Albany obliged to fly for his life, July 22nd, 1485.

Richard III had now begun his brief and precarious reign. A short negotiation speedily arranged a truce with Scotland, September 21st, 1484, which might have had some endurance if the monarchs who made it had remained steady on their thrones. But James, when he felt himself uncontrolled in his sovereignty, used it, as his inclinations determined him, in founding expensive establishments for the cultivation of music, and in the erection of chapels and palaces in a peculiar species of architecture, in which the Gothic style was mingled with an imitation of the Grecian orders. To meet the expense of these buildings and foundations, and to gratify his natural love of amassing treasure, James watched and availed himself of every opportunity by which he could collect money; nor did he hesitate to appropriate to these favourite purposes funds which the haughty nobles were disposed to consider as perquisites of their own. A particular instance of this nature hurried on James' catastrophe.

In order to maintain the expenses of a double choir in the royal chapel of Stirling, the king ventured to apply to that purpose the revenues of the priory of Coldingham. The two powerful families of Home [Hume or Hoome] and Hepburn had long accounted this wealthy abbey their own property. The king's appropriation of the revenues which they had considered as destined to the advantage of their friends and clansmen disposed these haughty chiefs to seek revenge as men who were suffering oppression. The spirit of dis-

[¹ "If ever subject deserved the death of a traitor, it was this last of the Black Douglases," says Hume Brown.² He died in prison, however, and Albany was killed by accident while witnessing a tournament in France in 1486.]

[1487-1488 A.D.]

content spread fast among the southern barons, much influenced by the earl of Angus, a nobleman both hated and feared by the king, who could not be supposed to have forgotten the manner in which he had acquired his popular epithet of Bell-the-Cat. In the vain hope of controlling his discontented nobles, the king showed his fears more than his wisdom by prohibiting them to appear in court in arms, with the exception of Ramsay, whose life had been spared upon his entreaty at the execution of Lauder bridge. James had made this young man captain of his guard, and created him a peer, by the name of Lord Bothwell, under which title the new favourite had succeeded, if not to the whole power, at least to much of the unpopularity of Cochrane, whose fate he had so nearly shared.

A NEW REVOLT AND THE DEATH OF JAMES III (1488 A.D.)

A league was now formed against James, which was daily increased by fresh adherents till it ended in a rebellion which could be compared to no similar insurrection in Scottish history save that of the Douglas in the preceding reign.

The fate of James III was not yet determined, notwithstanding this powerful combination. He had on his side the northern barons, and was at least as powerful as his father had been at the siege of Abercorn. But he had not his father's courage, or the sage counsels of Bishop Kennedy. The malcontents, instead of attending the king's summons to court, withdrew to the southward, and raised their banners in open insurrection. James, unnerved by his fears, repaired to the more northern regions, in which the strength of his adherents lay, and by the assistance of Athol, Crawford, Lindsay of the Byres, Ruthven, and other powerful chiefs of the east and north, assembled a considerable army. The insurgent lords advanced to the southern shores of the Forth.

During some indecisive skirmishes, and equally indecisive negotiations, the associated nobles contrived to get into their hands the king's eldest son, the duke of Rothesay, by the treachery of Shaw of Sauchie, his governor. This gave a colour to their enterprise which was of itself almost decisive of success. They erected the royal standard of Scotland in opposition to its monarch, and boldly proclaimed that they were in arms in behalf of the youthful prince, whose unnatural father intended to put him to death and to sell the country to the English.

The king retired upon Stirling; but the faithless Shaw, who had betrayed the prince to the rebel lords, completed his treachery by refusing James' access to the castle of that town. In a species of despair the king turned southward, like a stag brought to bay, with the purpose of meeting his enemies in conflict. The battle took place at Sauchieburn, June 11th, 1488, not far from Falkirk, where Wallace was defeated, and yet nearer to the memorable field of Bannockburn, where Bruce triumphed. At the first encounter the archers of the king's army had some advantage. But the Annandale men, whose spears were of unusual length, charged, according to their custom, with loud yells, and bore down the left wing of the king's forces. James, who was already dispirited from seeing his own banner and his own son brought in arms against him, and who remembered the prophecy of the witch, that he should fall by his nearest of kin, on hearing the cries of the border-men lost courage entirely, and turned his horse for flight. [His sword was found on the field.] As he fled at a gallop through the hamlet of Milltown, his charger, a fiery animal, presented to him on that very morning by Lindsay

[1488 A.D.]

of the Byres, took fright at the sight of a woman engaged in drawing water at a well, and threw to the ground his timid and inexperienced rider. The king was borne into the mill, where he was so incautious as to proclaim his name and quality. The consequence was, that some of the rebels who followed the chase entered the hut and stabbed him to the heart.^d

Though it is in some contradiction with the relations of Buchanan^m and Ferrerius,^p we give the story of Lindsay of Pitscottie, retaining in part its quaint language and spelling.^a

PITSCOTTIE'S ACCOUNT OF THE DEATH OF JAMES III

The king fell aff his horse before the mill door of Bannockburne, and so was brused with the fall, being heavie in armour, that he fell in ane deadlie swoon: And the miller and his wife haled him into the mill, and not knowing quhat he was, cast him up in a nook, and covered him with a cloth; while at the last the kingis host, knawing that he was fled, debated themselves manfully, and knowing that they were borderers and thieves that dealt with



WEST FRONT OF ST. ANDREWS

them, therefore they had the more courage to defend themselves. Nevertheless, they retired and fled in guid ordour quhill they came to the Torwood, and there debated long time till the night came, and fled away as quyetlie as they might, and part passed to Stirling. But their enemies, on the other side, followed them very sharply, so that there was many taken, hurt, and slain of them. As the kingis enemies were retiring back, the king himself was overcome lying in the mill, and cryed if there was a priest to make his confessioun. The miller and his wife hearing his words, inquyred of him quhat man he was, and what was his name.

He happened to say, unhappilie: "This day at morne I was your king." Then the milleris wife clapped her hands, and ran forth and cried for a priest. In the meantime ane priest was cvming by; sum says he was my lord Grayes servant;ⁱ quho answered and said, "here am I ane priest, quhere is the king?" Then the miller's wife took the priest by the hand and led him in at the mill

[ⁱ This priest in Lord Gray's service was said to be named Borthwick.]

[1488 A.D.]

door, and how soon as the priest saw the king he knew him incontinent, and kneilled down on his knies, and inquired of the king's grace if he might live if he had good leech-ment: he answered him he trowed he might, but he would have had a priest to tak his adwyce, and to give him his sacrament. The priest answered, "That sall I do haistilie"—and pulled out a whinger [dirk] and strak him four or fyve tymes evin to the heart, and syne got him on his back and had him away. But no man knew quhat he did with him, nor where he buried him. Nor no trail of the king was gotten a month thereafter. This battle was fought on the eighth day of June, in the yeir of God 1488 yeires.

This may be an example to all kings that come hereafter, not to fall from God, and to ground themselves upon the vaine sayings and illusiones of devilis and sorceris, as this feible king did, quhilk pat him in suspitioun of his nobilitie, and to murther and exyll his awin native brother. For, if he had used the counsall of his wyse lords and barons, he had not come to sick disparatioun, nor suspitione, quhilk he was moved to take be vaine and vicked persones, quhilk brought him to a mischievous end. Therefore we pray all godly kings to take example by him, and to fear God, and to use wyse and godlie counsall, having respect to their high calling, and to doe justice to all men.⁹

TYTLER'S ESTIMATE OF JAMES III

A body ascertained to be that of James was afterwards found in the neighbourhood, and interred with royal honours beside his queen, in the abbey of Cambuskenneth. Thus perished in the prime of life, and the victim of a conspiracy headed by his own son, James III of Scotland; a prince whose character appears to have been misrepresented and mistaken by writers of two very different parties, and whose real disposition is to be sought for neither in the mistaken aspersions of Buchanan,^m nor in the vague and indiscriminate panegyric of some later authors. Buchanan, misled by the attacks of a faction, whose interest it was to paint the monarch whom they had deposed and murdered as weak, unjust, and abandoned to low pleasures, has exaggerated the picture by his own prejudices and antipathies; other writers, amongst whom Abercromby^r is the most conspicuous, have, with an equal aberration from the truth, represented him as almost faultless.

That James had any design, similar to that of his able and energetic grandfather, of raising the kingly power upon the ruins of the nobility, is an assertion not only unsupported by authentic testimony, but contradicted by the facts which are already before the reader. That he was cruel or tyrannical is an unfounded aspersion, ungraciously proceeding from those who had experienced his repeated lenity, and who, in the last fatal scenes of his life, abused his ready forgiveness to compass his ruin. That he murdered his brother is an untruth, emanating from the same source, contradicted by the highest contemporary evidence, and abandoned by his worst enemies as too ridiculous to be stated at a time when they were anxiously collecting every possible accusation against him. Yet it figures in the classical pages of Buchanan;^m a very convincing proof of the slight examination which that great man was accustomed to bestow upon any story which coincided with his preconceived opinions, and flattered his prejudices against monarchy.

Equally unfounded was that imputation, so strongly urged against this prince by his insurgent nobles, that he had attempted to accomplish the perpetual subjection of the realm to England. His brother Albany had truly done so; and the original records of his negotiations, and of his homage sworn

to Edward, remain to this day, although we in vain look for an account of this extraordinary intrigue in the pages of the popular historians. In this attempt to destroy the independence of the kingdom, it is equally certain that Albany was supported by a great proportion of the nobility, who now rose against the king, and whose names appear in the contemporary muniments of the period; but we in vain look in the pages of the *Fœdera*,* or in the rolls of Westminster and the Tower, for an atom of evidence to show that James, in his natural anxiety for assistance against a rebellion of his own subjects, had ceased for a moment to treat with Henry VII as an independent sovereign. So far, indeed, from this being the case, we know that at a time when conciliation was necessary, he refused to benefit himself by sacrificing any portion of his kingdom, and insisted on the re-delivery of Berwick with an obstinacy which in all probability disgusted the English monarch, and rendered him lukewarm in his support.

James' misfortunes, in truth, are to be attributed more to the extraordinary circumstances of the times in which he lived than to any very marked defects in the character or conduct of the monarch himself, although both were certainly far from blameless. At this period, in almost every kingdom in Europe with which Scotland was connected, the power of the great feudal nobles and that of the sovereign had been arrayed in jealous and mortal hostility against each other. The time appeared to have arrived in which both parties seemed convinced that they were on the very confines of a great change, and that the sovereignty of the throne must either sink under the superior strength of the greater nobles, or the tyranny and independence of these feudal tyrants receive a blow from which it would not be easy for them to recover.

In this struggle another remarkable feature is to be discerned. The nobles, anxious for a leader, and eager to produce some counterpoise to the weight of the king's name and authority, generally attempted to seduce the heir apparent, or some one of the royal family, to favour their designs, bribing him to dethrone his parent or relation by the promise of placing him immediately upon the vacant throne.

In the struggle in Scotland, which ended by the death of the unfortunate monarch, it is important to observe, that although the pretext used by the barons was the resistance to royal oppression and the establishment of liberty, the middle classes and the great body of the people took no share. They did not side with the nobles, whose efforts on this occasion were entirely selfish and exclusive. On the contrary, so far as they were represented by the commissaries of the burghs who sat in parliament, they joined the party of the king and the clergy, by whom very frequent efforts were made to introduce a more effectual administration of justice, and a more constant respect for the rights of individuals and the protection of property.

James' great fault seems to have been a devotion to studies and accomplishments which, in this rude and warlike age, were deemed unworthy of his rank and dignity. He was an enthusiast in music, and took great delight in architecture, and the construction of splendid and noble palaces and buildings; he was fond of rich and gorgeous dresses, and ready to spend large sums in the encouragement of the most skilful and curious workers in gold and steel; and the productions of these artists, their inlaid armour, massive gold chains, and jewelled-hilted daggers, were purchased by him at high prices, whilst they themselves were admitted, if we believe the same writers, to an intimacy and friendship with the sovereign which disgusted the nobility.


The true account of this was, probably, that James received these ingenious

[1400-1488 A.D.]

artisans into his palace, where he gave them employment, and took pleasure in superintending their labours—an amusement for which he might have pleaded the example of some of the wisest and most popular sovereigns. But the barons, for whose rude and unintellectual society the monarch showed little predilection, returned the neglect with which they were unwisely treated by pouring contempt and ridicule upon the pursuits to which he was devoted. Cochrane, the architect, whose genius in an art which, in its higher branches, is eminently intellectual, had raised him to favour with the king, was stigmatised as a low mason. Rogers, whose musical compositions were fitted to refine and improve the barbarous taste of the age, and whose works were long after highly esteemed in Scotland, was ridiculed as a common fiddler or buffoon; and other artists, whose talents had been warmly encouraged by the sovereign, were treated with the same indignity. It would be absurd, however, from the evidence of such interested witnesses, to form our opinion of the true character of his favourites, as they have been termed, or of the encouragement which they received from the sovereign. To the Scottish barons of this age Phidias would have been but a marble-cutter, and Apelles no better than the artisan who stained their oaken wainscot.

The error of the king lay, not so much in the encouragement of ingenuity and excellence, as in the indolent neglect of those duties and cares of government, which were in no degree incompatible with his patronage of the fine arts. Had he possessed the energy and powerful intellect of his grandfather—had he devoted the greater portion of his time to the administration of justice, to a friendly intercourse with his feudal nobles, and a strict and watchful superintendence of their conduct in the offices intrusted to them, he might safely have employed his leisure in any way most agreeable to him. Nothing can justify the king's inattention to the cares of government, and the recklessness with which he shut his ears to the complaints and remonstrances of his nobility; but that he was cruel, unjust, or unforgiving—that he was a selfish and avaricious voluptuary—or that he drew down upon himself, by these dark portions of his character, the merited execration and vengeance of his nobles, is a representation founded on no authentic evidence, and contradicted by the uniform history of his reign and of his misfortunes.

By his queen, Margaret, daughter of Christian, king of Denmark, James left a family of three children, all of them sons: James, his successor; a second son, also named James, created marquis of Ormonde, and who afterwards became archbishop of St. Andrews; and John, earl of Mar, who died without issue. The king was eminently handsome; his figure was tall, athletic, and well-proportioned; his countenance combined intelligence with sweetness, and his deep brown complexion and black hair resembled the hue rather of the warmer climates of the south than that which we meet in colder latitudes. His manners were dignified, but somewhat cold and distant, owing to his reserved and secluded habits of life. He was murdered in the thirty-fifth year of his age and the twenty-eighth of his reign.^c



CHAPTER IX

JAMES IV AND FLODDEN FIELD

[1488-1513 A.D.]

The period covered by the reign of James IV was one of the most important in the history of western Europe since the introduction of Christianity. During these years began what is distinctively known as modern Europe in contradistinction to the Middle Age which preceded it. By many of his qualities James IV was peculiarly fitted to rule men in such a time of transition. In the case of the two most important actions of his reign we shall see that it was in the teeth of all that nobles and commons could urge that he carried out a policy which gratified his own whims at such terrible cost to his people. Thus master of his own kingdom, he was able, in spite of its comparative insignificance, to make it a real force in the rivalries of the greater European powers.—HUME BROWN.⁶

THE flight of James III had decided the battle of Sauchieburn which proved so fatal to him, and the lords of his party were suffered to withdraw towards Stirling without any vigorous pursuit, while the victors passed the night on the field. When intelligence was brought to the camp of the manner of the king's death, it is said that the prince was overwhelmed with grief and remorse, which, however, were soon forgotten amid the pomp and ceremony of his accession to the throne. The day after the battle the victors fell back upon Linlithgow and dismissed their army, and the first act of the new king was to reward those who had supported his cause. On this very day, the 12th of June, 1488, grants of lands were made to the Humes and Hepburns, who had been among the most powerful of the prince's supporters.

After the interment of the late king the court removed to Perth, and James IV was crowned, with the usual ceremonies, in the abbey of Scone on the 26th of June. The new king there committed the privy seal to the keeping of the prior of St. Andrews. James had before his elevation to the throne formed an attachment to the beautiful Margaret Drummond, the daughter of Lord Drummond, and her father, baser in his subserviency even than the other courtiers, encouraged an intimacy so dishonourable to his family.

One of the first cares of the new government was to examine the foreign relations of the kingdom, which were likely to be considerably shaken by a revolution of so violent a character. An embassy was sent to Henry VII of England, and a truce for three years was concluded between the two coun-

[1488-1490 A.D.]

tries. Parliament assembled at Edinburgh on the 4th of September, 1488. After the first preliminaries the persons charged with treason, including all who had borne arms on the late king's side in the field of Stirling, were summoned to appear and defend themselves. One great object of these proceedings was to throw the blame of the late rebellion,¹ and especially of the king's death, upon the party who had supported the crown, and, by a strange perversion of terms, the men who had supported the reigning monarch against his insurgent subjects were described as rebels and traitors. They were accused, singularly enough, of having attempted to bring into the kingdom their enemies of England and to reduce the crown of Scotland to a dependence on that country; and of having advised the late king repeatedly to break the agreements which he had made with his nobles. The earl of Buchan made a confession of guilt, and threw himself upon the king's mercy, in return for which he was pardoned and taken into favour. Ramsay, Lord Bothwell, the late king's favourite, who had escaped out of the kingdom, failing to appear, was condemned and his estates confiscated. The latter were given to the lord Hailes, who was made an earl. By another act, all grants signed by the late king since the 2nd of February, when the prince took the field in arms against his father, were revoked, because, as it was pretended, they were made for the assistance of the treasonable faction which had been enemies to the realm and to the present king.

The parliament was prorogued from time to time, holding, in fact, four different sessions. An attempt was made to restore order throughout the realm, and put an end to the practice of murder and robbery which then prevailed, by dividing the kingdom into districts, each of which was intrusted to the care of certain barons, who promised, on their oath, to do their utmost to detect and bring to punishment all offenders. Other laws were passed, providing for the better administration of justice, for the regulation and improvement of the commerce and coinage of the realm, and for putting a check on the practice of purchasing at the court of Rome presentations to benefices in Scotland.

THE NAVAL VICTORIES OF SIR ANDREW WOOD (1489-1490 A.D.)

Some naval successes occurred at this time to throw lustre on the commencement of the young king's reign. Sir Andrew Wood, a naval officer of great talent and experience, had distinguished himself in several actions against the English during the reign of James III, his known faithfulness to whom is said to have been a matter of considerable embarrassment to the prince and the nobles of his party after their victory at Sauchieburn. Although he refused to acknowledge the new government, Sir Andrew was still active in the service of his country, and successfully protected the coasts against the piratical attacks of the English cruisers, who, unauthorised by their own government, took advantage of the domestic troubles in Scotland to attack the Scottish merchant and fishing vessels, and even plundered some of the smaller coast towns.

In the February of the year 1490 a fleet of five English piratical ships entered the Clyde, and not only plundered the merchant ships, but gave chase to a vessel belonging to the king, and drove it into Dumbarton. The young king, provoked at this insult, again invited Sir Andrew Wood on shore,

[¹ The rebels voted themselves "innocent, white, and free" of all guilt in the late king's death.]

[1490 A.D.]

and appealed to his patriotism, pointing out the danger and disgrace incurred by the whole nation in thus allowing a few ships to insult their coasts.

From this moment Wood appears to have given his entire support to the young monarch. He undertook at once to attack the pirates, and when the courtiers recommended him to provide himself with a more numerous fleet, he replied with some pride that the two ships he had—the *Flower* and the *Yellow Carvel*—were enough for him. He immediately spread his sails, and finding the five English ships at anchor off the town of Dunbar, he captured them all after a desperate action, and bringing his prizes into Leith, presented their five captains to the king.

Sir Andrew Wood now became a favourite with the king, who began to show an extraordinary taste for naval architecture. King Henry, though he was unwilling to break the truce, had been heard to express his wish that some one would reduce the pride of the Scottish sailors. Wood had been sent, for some purpose or other, to the coast of Flanders, and an enterprising merchant of London, named Stephen Bull, determined to intercept the Scottish commander on his return. Bull fitted out three good ships, and cast anchor behind the May, a small island off the mouth of the Forth, where he watched for the return of the two Scottish ships of war.

The *Flower* and the *Yellow Carvel* found themselves unexpectedly in the presence of a formidable enemy. Sir Andrew had barely time to prepare for action when, as he approached, the English ships opened their fire upon him; the Scottish ships closed with the English, and lashed them together with cables. A desperate combat followed, which although it began early in the morning, at the approach of night was still undecided. At the return of day the trumpets were sounded as the signal for renewing the combat, and they continued to fight with so much resolution that, unconsciously, they allowed themselves to drift with the tide into the mouth of the Tay.

Here the shore on each side was soon covered with crowds of people, shouting and gesticulating to encourage their countrymen. Victory at length decided in favour of Sir Andrew Wood, who captured the three English vessels, which he carried into Dundee. Thence he proceeded to court, and presented the English commander to the king. James generously set all prisoners at liberty, and sent them back to England, with an earnest remonstrance to King Edward on the depredations of his subjects. Wood rose to the highest degree of favour, and the king kept him much about his person at court as his instructor in naval matters, and rewarded him with grants of lands.

THE RESTORATION OF ORDER

This battle was gained on the 10th of August, 1490. The victory was the more welcome, because it came almost at the same moment that James gained a signal success over the lords who had risen up in arms against him. The vigorous conduct of the faction which had raised the king to the throne, and the unscrupulous use they had made of their power, did not entirely discourage their opponents. Two nobles who had hitherto acted with the party in power, but who are supposed to have been disappointed in their expectations of reward, the earl of Lennox and the lord Lisle, began the revolt.

Lord Forbes, another of the insurgent nobles, marched about with the king's shirt, all bloody and torn with the blows that had caused his death, displayed on the end of a spear, which was thus exhibited through Aberdeen and the chief towns of the adjacent counties. The public were excited by this exhibition, and by the exhortations with which it was accompanied;

[1490-1494 A. D.]

and the overgrown power of the Hepburns, with the overbearing conduct of Lord Drummond and his sons, who presumed on the influence of Margaret Drummond over the king, to commit great disorders, were themes which the opponents of the existing government turned to the utmost advantage. The king lost no time in proceeding against the northern rebels, and within a very short period the revolt was entirely suppressed.

Most of those engaged in it were pardoned, and the leaders were soon afterwards taken into favour. "Thus," says Buchanan,^c "in a short time, all parties being reconciled, jocund peace and universal tranquillity ensued; and, as if fortune had become handmaid to the king's virtues, a plentiful harvest followed, and a golden season seemed to have arisen after the more than iron age. The king, however, when he had repressed public robberies by arms, and other vices by the severities of the laws, lest he should be thought to be a severe avenger to others, and too indulgent to himself, in order to show openly that his father was put to death against his desire, bound an iron chain around his body, to which he added a link every year during his life."

An embassy had been sent to France and other courts to seek a bride for the youthful monarch. Another embassy was sent to Denmark, to renew the friendly relations with that country, in 1492, and the archbishop of St. Andrews went to England, and an amicable arrangement was soon after made with King Henry for the regulation of the borders and the prolongation of the truce [by the Treaty of Coldstream, October, 1488].

A parliament was held at Edinburgh in the summer of 1493, which was occupied with measures of resistance to the encroachments of the court of Rome in regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

James determined to consolidate his kingdom by reducing the Highland clans to a more regular form of government than any to which they had hitherto submitted. To give greater effect to his plans, he made frequent visits to the Highlands, and accustomed his subjects in the north to the presence of their sovereign. He thus proceeded twice in the year 1490 from Perth across the mountains to the head of Loch Rannoch; he also made two visits to the Highlands in 1493, penetrating to Dunstaffnage and Mingarry; and in 1494 he thrice visited the Isles.

These progresses were attended with the most salutary effects. The wild people of the north, unaccustomed to the pageantry of the court, were now taught to look with respect on the crown; and the rapidity of the king's movements, the ease with which he penetrated into their mountain wilds, the success with which he proceeded against those who resisted, and the generosity with which he rewarded his friends, produced everywhere a ready submission to his will. The lord of the Isles was the only one whose great power encouraged him to offer serious resistance, and he was cited before a parliament at Edinburgh in 1493, and having been condemned of high treason, was deprived of his possessions, which were forfeited to the crown.

JAMES IV SUPPORTS PERKIN WARBECK

While James was thus restoring order and peace at home, his foreign relations were gradually assuming a more hostile character. He knew that Henry VII had given his countenance to conspiracies against his crown, and he was not unwilling to retaliate by giving his secret support to those who attempted to overthrow the government then established in England. Mutual suspicions increased the estrangement between the two princes, until at length, when the mysterious conspiracy of Perkin Warbeck led to an open attack on

[1494-1497 A.D.]

the English monarch, James did not hesitate publicly to give it his support. It is supposed that the king of Scots had been in the secret of this plot long before the impostor was brought forward on the stage, and there can be no doubt that he had long been engaged in intimate correspondence with the duchess of Burgundy, the inveterate enemy of Henry VII, and the chief fosterer of Warbeck's plot.

When this impostor was in Ireland King James held open communication with him, and formally acknowledged him as duke of York; and when, in the November of 1494, the king received intelligence from Flanders that the pretended prince would visit Scotland, he made preparations for receiving him in the most honourable manner. James and the Scots in general seem to have been perfectly convinced that Warbeck was the person he pretended to be, and he was everywhere treated as the duke of York, and, among other favours, the king gave him in marriage his cousin, the beautiful Catherine Gordon, a daughter of the earl of Huntley. He was allowed to state his case before the king's council, and it was determined that he should be assisted in making war on his enemy, the usurper King Henry.^a

Warbeck agreed to restore Berwick to Scotland when he was seated on the throne, and James led an invasion into Northumberland, September 20th, 1496. As described in our history of England, the people refused to rise in Warbeck's favour, and James was disgusted at the pretender's own mildness in his treatment of the recalcitrant populace whom he hoped to rule. Accordingly, James returned to Scotland and signed the Truce of Ayton with England, September, 1497, leaving Warbeck to pursue his own vicissitudes till their end on the gallows of Tyburn.^a

PEACEFUL RELATIONS WITH ENGLAND; THE KING MARRIES THE PRINCESS MARGARET (1499-1508 A.D.)

As King James advanced in years he gained in the love of his subjects and of his nobility. The latter, accustomed under two monarchs to be treated with suspicious jealousy, and often with stern hostility, seem to have rejoiced in a king whose prejudices were in their favour, and to have been willing at last to remain in tranquillity. James possessed many qualities which rendered him popular among his subjects of the middle and inferior classes. Generous and open in his manners, and fond of gaiety and mixing with the world, he, at the same time, partook in many of the more refined tastes of his father.

The reign of James IV was the golden age of the old Scottish literature, and boasts of such names as Dunbar and Gawain Douglas; but James' favourite pursuits were architecture and navigation. He lived in an age when wonderful discoveries of distant lands had drawn the attention of the wise and learned to the sea, and when the princes of Christendom began to be more than ever anxious for the possession of powerful fleets. Scotland could hardly be said to possess a royal fleet when the king ascended the throne, yet among her merchants and traders were many able and enterprising seamen, among whom we need only mention Sir Andrew Wood of Largo, Andrew and John Barton, Sir Alexander Mathison, and William Merrimouth of Leith. These men the king liked to have about his person, and under their directions he applied himself with great ardour to the study of naval affairs. He went out on short experimental voyages; mixed with

[^a The Spanish envoy Ayala • called James an excellent historian and a linguist, but Buchanan • makes him out "illiterate after the vices of his time."]

[1497-1503 A.D.]

the seamen and sailors; encouraged them with rewards and presents, and flattered their commanders by visiting them familiarly in their houses. Above all things, he paid attention to gunnery, and he not only prided himself on his train of artillery, but he practised with it himself.

King Henry's policy towards Scotland had been pacific in the extreme, and had been met with no unfriendly feeling by James, who was influenced by the intervention of Spain. Pedro de Ayala, the Spanish envoy at the court of England, had proceeded to Scotland in the year 1497 with a missive to King James from his sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella, and he soon acquired so much influence over the prince to whom he was thus accredited, that he was appointed his principal commissioner in the negotiations with England. The result of these negotiations was the truce of seven years, concluded, as we have seen, at Ayton, on the 30th of September, 1497, and it was soon afterwards agreed that this truce should continue during the lives of the two monarchs, and for a year after the death of the survivor.

Soon afterwards Ayala left Scotland, and James, no longer influenced by his counsels, seems to have been less earnest in his pacific negotiations, which were interrupted by the circumstances just related. They were now renewed with increased confidence, and the English king having sent his vice-admiral, Ryder, as ambassador to the Scottish court, the truce was finally signed at Stirling on the 20th of July, 1499.

This important matter being arranged, King Henry sought with a wise policy to cement the alliance between the two countries by a new tie. A proposal had been made long before for a marriage between King James and King Henry's eldest daughter, the princess Margaret, which had met with the approbation of the wisest statesmen of both countries; but different circumstances, combined with the tender age of the lady, and James' attachment to Margaret Drummond, had interrupted the negotiations on this subject. They were now, however, renewed, and James' nobles, fearful perhaps of the influence of the mistress combined with the king's impetuous temper, warmly recommended the union.

Commissioners on the part of the two kings held repeated meetings and consultations, the result of which was that the king and the princess were betrothed in the year 1500, although the marriage treaty was not finally signed till the 24th of January, 1503. It was stipulated in this treaty, that as the princess Margaret had not yet completed her twelfth year, her father should not be obliged to send her to Scotland before the 1st day of September, 1503; and within fifteen days after her arrival there King James was bound to espouse her. The usual arrangements were made as to the income to be settled on the queen, and the dowry to be paid with her.

It is supposed that the slowness with which the negotiations had been carried on was principally caused by the opposition of the Drummonds; but the influence on which they relied was suddenly broken by a domestic tragedy, which, though involved in the deepest mystery, we can hardly help connecting with the jealousy of the Scottish nobles. While the treaty of marriage with England had not yet received the royal signature, and James seemed unaccountably backward in giving it, the lady Margaret Drummond and her two sisters, Euphemia and Sibylla, who were then at Drummond Castle, were suddenly seized with illness after a repast, and died in great agony, with all the symptoms of having been poisoned. The circumstances of their death seem to have been studiously concealed, and their bodies were hastily removed to Dunblane and there buried immediately, without any

further inquiry. After this occurrence no further delay appears to have taken place in the preparations for the English marriage.

The chain was now broken with which James had so long been bound, and he prepared eagerly for his marriage. At the beginning of August, 1503, the princess Margaret proceeded to Scotland, in charge of the earl of Surrey. She was now fourteen years old, while James had reached his thirty-first year. When Margaret reached Newbattle, only a few miles short of Edinburgh, James himself came to meet her. We are told by a contemporary writer that the king flew to Newbattle, like a bird that seeks its prey, and that, entering her chamber, he found her playing at cards. After the first familiar salutation, he entertained her by his performance on the clavichord and lute. When he departed he leaped on his fine courser without putting his foot in the stirrup, and set off at full speed, leaving his train far behind him. Perceiving, however, that the earl of Surrey had come out to greet him, he turned back and saluted the earl barehead. At his next visit, the queen exhibited her musical skill, while he listened with bended knee. On another occasion, the king came with a retinue of forty horse, while he rode himself on a mule. Everything was done to show the ardour of a youthful lover, eager to throw himself at the feet of the mistress of his heart.

When at length the princess Margaret left Dalkeith to proceed to the capital, James met her half way, mounted on a bay horse trapped with gold, he and his attendants riding, to use the phrase of the old writer, as if after a hare. When they reached the suburbs of Edinburgh the princess descended from her litter, and mounted upon a pillion behind the king, and they thus rode through the streets of the city to the palace, amid the acclamations of the populace. On the 8th of August the marriage was solemnised in the abbey church of Holyrood, by the archbishop of St. Andrews. The days were passed in tournaments and similar pageantry, in which the king distinguished himself by his strength and martial skill.

THE SCOTCH NAVY; THE CONQUEST OF DONALD DHU

The numerous attendance of foreigners at James' wedding showed the high respect which he had already gained abroad. Indeed, but a few months had passed since the Scottish king had been enabled to send a strong auxiliary force to assist the king of Denmark against the revolted Norwegians, in 1502. He was enabled to give effective assistance to his northern ally and kinsman by the excellence of his fleet, for the improvement and perfection of which he never ceased to labour.

Among the ships he was now building was one to which he gave the name of the *Great St. Michael*, which far exceeded in magnitude any that had previously been made in western Europe. The dimensions of this huge vessel are given by Pitscottie, who tells us that in his days they were preserved at Tullibardine, "planted in hawthorn, the length and breadth, by the wright that helped to make her." She was two hundred and forty feet long, and thirty-six wide within the sides, which were ten feet thick. We are told that, in building this vessel, all the oak woods of Fife, except Falkland, were used up, besides what was brought from Norway.

While the king was rendering himself popular in the south, the spirit of revolt had again shown itself in the north. We have already mentioned James' personal visits to the Highlands in the early part of his reign, and the success which attended them. At the close of the century, for some reason with which we are unacquainted, his policy towards the Highlanders was

[1503-1504 A.D.]

suddenly changed, and in place of his former moderation, he became oppressive and unjust. He summarily revoked charters which he had granted himself, and, having appointed the earl of Argyll his lieutenant, he gave him authority to lease out nearly the whole lordship of the Isles. The old landholders were expelled ignominiously from the possessions of their forefathers, which were given to enrich the supporters of the king's policy and measures.

At this time (in 1502) Donald Dhu, the grandson of John lord of the Isles, had been shut up a close prisoner in the castle of Inchconnal for forty years, and the men of the Isles, who, in spite of the illegitimacy of his birth, looked upon him as the true heir of Ross and Innisgail, determined to set him at liberty, and proclaim him their king. The Mac-Ians of Glencoe led the insurrection, and having surprised the castle of Inchconnal, they carried Donald Dhu in triumph to Torquil Macleod's castle, in the isle of Lewis. This exploit was the signal for a general revolt of the fierce population of these districts, who overran Badenoch with fire and sword, and burned the town of Inverness.

James was well aware of the dangerous confederacy which had been formed in the north, and he instantly called forth the military array of the kingdom. The supreme command of this army was afterwards intrusted to the earl of Arran. All the king's improvements in ships and artillery were brought to bear upon the northerners, and produced a proportionate impression.

It was now especially that James felt the importance of his fleet. A small squadron, under Sir Andrew Wood and another of his ablest seamen, Robert Barton, proceeded to the Isles, and the king, who was preparing an attack on the turbulent clans of Eskdale and Teviotdale, accompanied them as far as Dumbarton. The rebellion was thus soon appeased, and the chiefs who had supported the crown were rendered still more loyal by liberal grants of the confiscated lands.

In the midst of these proceedings, between the breaking out of this northern insurrection and the sending of the fleet, James had called a parliament to give force to his measures of repression. This parliament met at Edinburgh on the eleventh of March, 1504, and proceeded at once to pass a variety of acts, the direct object of which was the reformation and civilisation of the Highlands. Other steps were taken by this parliament for facilitating the administration of justice throughout the kingdom. It appears that much confusion and delay of justice occurred in the court of the lords of the session, from the great accumulation of cases, for the relief of which a court of daily council was appointed, the judges of which were to be appointed by the king, and they were to hold their sittings in Edinburgh.

An act was passed restricting the granting of comprehensive pardons, under which persons guilty of great crimes had been accustomed to purchase impunity. Various other laws were made at this time for protecting agriculture, for regulating the letting of lands, and for equalising weights and measures. It was finally declared that all barons or freeholders, whose annual revenue was less than a hundred marks, might absent themselves from the meeting of the three estates, provided they sent their procurators to answer for them; but that those whose income exceeded that sum should be obliged to attend, a law which affected the constitution of the parliament itself.

This parliament was followed, as we have already stated, by the expedition against the Highlanders, on his return from which the king marched with his powerful army to punish the borderers for their plundering propensities. He had first sent a messenger to the English king, requesting his co-operation

in the task of purging the borders of thieves, who disturbed the peace of both kingdoms, and accordingly the English warden, Lord Dacre, was ordered to repair to James's headquarters at Lochmaben. This "raid of Eskdale," as it was called, was long remembered on the border for the summary justice which was executed upon multitudes of turbulent marauders. Scarcely a month had passed after this expedition when James found it necessary to make another progress in the north, by way of Scone, Forfar, Aberdeen, and Elgin, as far as Forres, for the purpose of examining the proceedings of the judges and seeing personally that the laws were properly executed.

The next year a new insurrection broke out in the Isles, headed by Torquil Macleod, with Maclean of Dowart, Macquarrie of Ulva, Macneil of Barra, and Mackinnon. A fleet under the command of John Barton was again sent to the northern seas, and the earl of Huntley was directed to invade the Isles from the north, while the king himself proceeded against them from the south. By these vigorous measures the rebellion was quickly suppressed, and in 1506 the northern hold of Torquil Macleod, the castle of Stornaway in Lewis, was taken by storm, and the power of its lord entirely destroyed. Donald Dhu, whom the insurgents had proclaimed king of the Isles, escaped to Ireland, where he died.

In this manner the king reduced his whole kingdom to such a state of order and good government, that about a year later he took what might have been considered a somewhat hazardous method of testing the obedience of his subjects to the laws. He set out on horseback secretly and alone, with nothing but his riding cloak cast round him, his hunting knife at his belt, and six-and-twenty pounds in his purse for his travelling expenses. Thus equipped, he rode from Stirling to Perth, and thence by Aberdeen and Elgin to the shrine of St. Duthoc in Ross, where he heard mass. The king related with pride that through this long and solitary progress he met with no interruption, and saw nothing but tranquillity; and having made himself known, and assembled the principal nobles and gentry of the districts through which he had passed, he returned with them in a sumptuous progress to Stirling.

JAMES COMES IN CONFLICT WITH HENRY VIII

Proud of his fleet, James began to interfere more in the political affairs of the Continent. Among all his foreign allies he was most partial to France. This led to a certain degree of estrangement between Scotland and England, and the breach was increased when, after the Spanish successes in Italy, James entered into an offensive alliance with France against Spain, the favourite ally of King Henry VII. Soon after this he exerted himself successfully in protecting the duke of Guelders from the designs of the emperor Maximilian. And when an embassy from the pope came to urge him to break off his alliance with the French king, he was so far from listening to it that he offered to send Louis an auxiliary force of four thousand Scots to serve in his wars in Italy. In 1508 the archbishop of St. Andrews and the earl of Arran were sent on an embassy to France to procure commercial privileges.

The death of Henry VII on the 21st of April, 1509, came to render more difficult the relations with England. The Scottish monarch was becoming gradually so much attached to France that he allowed himself to be led into a course of policy which was injurious to his country and fatal to himself. The pacific temper of Henry VII had been extremely favourable to the advancing prosperity of Scotland, and James had begun to assume a proud and haughty bearing in his transactions with the sister country; but in his

[1507-1511 A.D.]

brother-in-law, Henry VIII, he found a prince who was as proud and intemperate as himself; and although mutual congratulations were exchanged on his accession to the throne, it was not likely that the amity between them would last long undisturbed.

The ocean seems at this time to have been considered a sort of open field, on which the ships of one nation did not scruple to attack and plunder those of another whenever they thought they could do it with impunity.

A few years before the time of which we are speaking the Hollanders had taken and plundered a small fleet of Scottish merchantmen, and slain the crews. This was not considered a subject for diplomatic remonstrance between the two countries; but Andrew Barton was sent with a squadron to punish the depredators, which he did so effectually that he sent home to his king a multitude of hogsheads filled with the heads of the Dutch sailors. On another occasion the Bartons had been attacked and plundered by the Portuguese, upon which King James granted letters of reprisal, which were soon carried into effect.

The Portuguese navy and commerce were at this time the richest and most powerful in the world, and the Scottish navigators would gain too much in such an extensive field of depredation to leave it. At length, in 1507, John Barton, the father, was taken in his ship, the *Lion*, and imprisoned at Campvere, in Zealand. This provoked King James to renew and extend the letters of reprisal to Barton's sons. The Bartons now seem for two years to have carried on an indiscriminate war with the Portuguese merchant navy, and, under cover of this excuse, with those of other nations. It is said that these ships, and especially Andrew Barton with the *Lion* and a smaller vessel, watched off the English ports to attack the merchantmen as they entered, and captured many and carried them to Scotland as prizes under pretence that they were laden with Portuguese goods.

Two English ships were sent to watch in the Downs, and attack Andrew Barton on his return from a cruise which he was making against the Portuguese; according to some accounts the expedition was undertaken by order of King Henry, who was irritated by the frequent complaints of his merchants; according to others, the ships were fitted out privately by the earl of Surrey. The two ships now sent to intercept Andrew Barton were placed under the command of the earl of Surrey's two sons, the lord Thomas Howard and Sir Edward Howard. The two Howards put to sea immediately, and had the fortune to fall in with Barton's two ships, the *Lion* (one of the largest ships in the Scottish navy, and inferior in size only to the *Great Harry*, the largest ship of war belonging to England), and an armed bark called the *Jenny Perwin*. The latter tried to make her escape, and was closely pursued by Sir Edward Howard, while the lord Howard engaged with Barton.

Both parties fought with the utmost obstinacy, and it is said that Barton, when he lay on the deck desperately wounded, still continued to encourage his men with his whistle, till he was killed by a cannon-ball. His ship was then boarded and captured; the bark was overtaken and soon surrendered, and both ships were carried into the Thames. The vessels were detained as lawful prizes, but their crews, after a short imprisonment, were sent home to Scotland.

King James was enraged at the insult offered to his navy, as well as for the loss of one of his best ships and the death of a favourite officer, and he sent a herald to the court of England to remonstrate and demand redress in threatening language. But King Henry condescended to give no other reply than that the defeat of pirates ought never to be a matter of dispute among

[1511-1513 A.D.]

princes. The great sensation which the defeat of Andrew Barton seems to have caused in England, and the length of time during which it was remembered with pride, furnishes a decisive proof that the English must have suffered much from the depredations of the Scottish rovers. The defeat of Andrew Barton is placed by the annalists in August, 1511.

Another cause of irritation between the two countries occurred about the same time, in the revenge of Andrew Ker on the English murderers of his father, Sir Robert Ker. Engaging warmly in the interests of the king of France, James watched with anxiety the various leagues and combinations which were made for or against him; and when at length in the beginning of the year 1511 the English monarch joined the Italian league against Louis, James took up earnestly the quarrel of the latter. James was offended at the same time by some attacks of the English on his continental allies, and by Henry's refusal to deliver to the Scottish queen the jewels which had been bequeathed to her by her father.

At the beginning of 1512 Henry declared war against France; and soon afterwards his ambassador, along with those of France, Spain, and the pope, arrived at James's court. James treated Henry's pacific proposals with coldness; he spoke with indignation against the league into which he had entered against France, and laboured earnestly but in vain to reconcile Louis and the pope.

It still remained doubtful whether James would plunge into war or not. He had talked loudly, and had made great preparations, and he had already ordered his naval commanders to look out for English ships, but when he had completed his fleet he found that he had spent all his money in preparations, and that he had none left for carrying on the war. Offers of accommodation were made on both sides, which ended in James insisting on Henry's abandoning the league against France.

The two countries could hardly be said to be at peace, for his naval commanders had obtained letters of reprisal, and Leith was crowded with English prizes. James at the same time attempted to raise up a war against the English monarch in Ireland by entering into negotiations with O'Donnell, of Ulster, and that chieftain repaired to the Scottish court in the spring of 1513. He was at the same time encouraged in his designs by the arrival of ships from Denmark bringing him a contribution of arms and ammunition; and La Motte came with a French squadron laden with provisions for the fleet, and brought rich presents from King Louis to the Scottish nobles who were believed to exercise most influence over his mind.

But James was finally decided by one of those incidents which manifested his weakness and want of prudence. It appears that his backwardness had already alarmed Louis, and his queen, Anne of Brittany, well aware of his temper, addressed James in a romantic letter,¹ in which she claimed his protection as a distressed damsel who was attacked by a traitorous monarch, and she sent him a ring from her finger as to her own faithful knight, accompanied with a present of fourteen thousand crowns. The French king had not calculated without reason on the success of this artful stratagem, for from the moment he received the letter James seems to have resolved on

[¹ In the words of Pitscottie: "The queene of France also writt ane love lettre to the king of Scotland, nameing him hir love, shewing him that shoe had suffered meikle rebulke for his saik in France, for the defending of his honour, quhairfoir shoe beleived that he wold recompence hir with sum of his kinglie support in sick ane necessitie, that is, that he wold raise ane armie and cum thrie fute on Inglis ground, for hir sak, and to that effect shoe sent him ane ring aff hir finger, worth fyfteine thousand French crounes."]

[1513 A.D.]

hostilities; and when soon afterwards intelligence arrived that King Henry had landed in France, he ordered his army to assemble, and his ships to put to sea.

THE DISASTROUS WAR WITH ENGLAND, AND JAMES' DEATH ON FLODDEN FIELD

On both elements James' proceedings ended most disastrously. His fleet was one in which at that day he might justly take pride. It consisted of the *Great Michael*, already described, with a thirty-oared galley belonging to her; of thirteen great ships of war, and of about the same number of smaller vessels. This fleet was well provisioned, and carried on board three thousand soldiers under the command of the earl of Arran, who, from his superior feudal rank, had the chief command of the fleet as well as the army. James embarked in the *Great Michael*, and remained some days with the fleet, encouraging the seamen.

When he left, Arran, whose incapacity as a commander was soon obvious, instead of obeying the king's orders, which were to sail immediately for France, proceeded to the coast of Ireland, where he landed his troops and stormed the town of Carrickfergus, which was plundered and burned, and its inhabitants, without regard to age or sex, treated with the most brutal barbarity. After this exploit the earl returned with the fleet to Ayr to dispose of the plunder. James was greatly enraged when he heard of the earl of Arran's proceedings, and he immediately sent Sir Andrew Wood to supersede him in the command. Before he reached the coast Arran had again set sail, but all we know of the further history of his fleet is that it did reach France, and that at the beginning of the next reign a few of the ships returned in a shattered and disabled state. It is supposed that the *Great Michael* and most of the other ships were sold for a trifle to the king of France, and that they rotted in foreign harbours or were broken up for the timber.

After the fleet had departed the king employed himself with the utmost activity to assemble his army, and although the war was not generally popular, James was so much beloved by his subjects that they flocked from all parts to his standard, and even the clans from the Highlands and the Isles joined their sovereign under their different chiefs. The army thus assembled amounted at the lowest estimate to a hundred thousand men.

James had already sent a messenger to King Henry, who was in France, bearing a letter of recrimination and defiance, in which he made a long enumeration of injuries, true or imaginary, which he had experienced from that monarch. James' messenger found the king of England in his camp before Terouanne, and when he delivered his letter Henry burst into an ungovernable passion. The herald replied to this outburst of anger by a denunciation of war.

James showed by no means the same activity in making war that he had manifested in preparing for it, and he had to contend with the earnest exhortations of his queen and of many of his best counsellors, who deprecated the war. He seems, however, no longer to have hesitated in his resolution, and a first demonstration of hostilities was made by his chamberlain, Lord Home, who crossed the border with a force of eight thousand men, and after plundering and laying waste the adjoining districts of England, returned homeward with his booty. But with an extraordinary neglect of military precautions he forgot to push on his picquets, and at a pass called Broomhouse was charged furiously by Bulmer's cavalry, and so entirely defeated that the lord Home fled for his life, leaving his banner on the field, and his brother,

[1513 A.D.]

Sir George Home, a prisoner in the hands of the victors. The Scots lost on this occasion five hundred men slain and four hundred taken prisoners.

King James, deeply mortified at the result of this invasion, determined immediately to march into England at the head of his army and wipe off the disgrace of Home's defeat. This fatal determination was earnestly combated by the queen and those who were in favour of peace, and unable to make any impression on his obstinate temper, they seem to have made an attempt to work upon his superstitious feelings. The king had summoned his army to assemble at Edinburgh, and while they were there voices were heard at the dead hour of midnight, at the market cross of Edinburgh, where citations were usually made, summoning the king and the chief leaders of the army to appear within sixty days at the bar of the infernal judge. Before he left Linlithgow to place himself at the head of his troops, James attended as usual the service of vespers in the church of St. Michael.

Suddenly an old man, bareheaded and of venerable appearance, was seen to enter the church and approach him. His hair, which was of a bright golden colour, flowed over his shoulders, but it was thinly scattered over his smooth, bald forehead. He was clad in a long robe of blue, girt about the middle with a linen girdle. The crowd made way respectfully as the stranger approached, and proceeding directly to the king, he leaned over the chair where he was kneeling, and addressed him in a solemn and distinct voice—"I am sent to warn thee against proceeding in thy present undertaking, which admonition if thou neglect it will not fare well either with thee or with those who accompany thee; I am also ordered to warn thee to beware of familiarity with women, for if thou do otherwise, it will occasion thy destruction and disgrace." The speaker then withdrew in the same mysterious manner, and when, as soon as the service was ended, James ordered him to be brought into his presence, he was not to be found, nor could anybody tell how he had vanished. Buchanan^c received the account of this incident from Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, who was standing by the king's chair at the time of the occurrence.

If this apparition caused any misgivings in the royal mind they were quickly dissipated when he arrived at Edinburgh and found himself at the head of one of the most numerous and best-equipped armies that a Scottish monarch had ever led into the field. His large train of artillery was at that time remarkable. With his army, after having passed it in review in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, he marched, apparently with no definite plan of operations, and entering England on the 22nd of August, encamped on the banks of the river Till, one of the tributaries to the Tweed, at a place called Twiselhaugh. He remained here two days, and on the 24th of August issued a proclamation promising that the heirs of all who fell in the present campaign should inherit without payment of the usual feudal fines.

The next few days were spent in exploits unworthy to occupy the time of a splendid army like that which James had brought into the country of his enemy. He first marched down the Tweed, and invested the castle of Norham, which held out for a week. He then returned up the river and besieged and took the castle of Wark. He then advanced a few miles and took and destroyed the small fortresses of Etal and Ford, the latter belonging to Sir William Heron, who was still his prisoner in Scotland. Much precious time was thrown away in these unprofitable undertakings; but this was not all. In the capture of Ford the Lady Heron, a beautiful but artful woman, fell into James' hands, and [it is said] he became deeply enamoured, and that she used her influence over his affections to cause still further delays,

[1513 A.D.]

while she kept up a secret correspondence with the English leaders. Time was thus given to the latter to concentrate their forces and march against the invaders.^a

The English, under the earl of Surrey, met the Scotch at the fatal hill of Flodden, September 9th, 1513, where, as described at length in our history of England, the Scotch army was overpowered after having apparently gained the day.^a

No one thought of abandoning the king who with useless valour fought amidst the foremost in the conflict. Night at last separated the combatants; and the Scottish, like a wounded warrior, whom his courage sustains so long as the conflict lasts, but who faints with loss of blood when it is ended, became sensible of the extent of their loss, and melted in noiseless retreat from the field of battle in which the king and his nobles had perished.

There lay slain on the fatal field of Flodden twelve Scottish earls, thirteen lords, and five eldest sons of peers—fifty chiefs, knights, and men of eminence, and about ten thousand common men. Scotland had sustained defeats in which the loss had been numerically greater, but never one in which the number of the nobles slain bore such a proportion to those of the inferior rank. The cause was partly the unusual obstinacy of the long defence, partly that when the common people began, as already mentioned, to desert their standards, the nobility and gentry were deterred by shame and a sense of honour from following their example.

The Scots historians long contested the fact that James IV fell in the field of Flodden, and denied that the body which the English exhibited as the corpse of that unhappy king was in reality that of their sovereign. Some supposed that having escaped from the slaughter, James had gone to the Holy Land as a pilgrim to appease the resentment of heaven, which he conceived had sent his last misfortune in vengeance for his accession to his father's death. But there is no doubt in the present day that the body of James was found and carried to Berwick by the lord Dacre, to whom the king must have been personally well known. It was afterwards interred in the monastery of Sheen or Richmond. The corpse was pierced with two arrows and had received the mortal wound from a bill or battle-axe. This amiable but ill-fated monarch left two lawful children, James, his successor, and Alexander, a posthumous infant, who did not live two years. James IV was the only Scottish king that fell in battle with the English since the defeat and death of Malcolm III near Alnwick. He fell in his forty-first year, after he had reigned twenty-six years.^a

SCOTCH FEUDALISM

In turning our inquiries to the progress and improvement of the Scots during this period, we still find our materials both scanty and obscure. The Scottish kings were not absolute sovereigns, as in other countries of Europe, but of limited power and authority; and it depended upon their own individual energies whether that little might not be reduced to an absolute non-entity. Hence the difficulty of understanding the form of government that prevailed in Scotland as compared with that of England.

If the Scottish king was brave and active, he could only maintain his regal superiority by availing himself of the mutual jealousies of his nobles, and arming the one half against the other; but if, on the other hand, he was weak or facile, he generally sank into their tool and reigned by their sufferance. All this is evident in the history of Robert Bruce, as contrasted with that of

Robert III; or of James I and James II with that of James III. In either case, it was a continual struggle for superiority between king and nobles, where the latter claimed an independence almost equal to his own. In the case of these sovereigns, also, we find nothing of that divinity that hedges a king,¹ by which his person is invested with such sacredness as to exempt it from violence, and his authority with such abstract right that to resist it is sinful, as well as unconstitutional.¹

As Laing² says: "The Scots were seldom distinguished for loyalty." And Brodie³ writes: "The little respect paid to royalty is conspicuous in every page of Scottish history." Wilkes expressed himself in the House of Commons: "Scotland seems, indeed, the natural foyer of rebellion, as Egypt of the plague." And Nimmo⁴ said: "Never was any race of monarchs more unfortunate than the Scottish. Their reigns were generally turbulent and disastrous, and their own end often tragical."⁴

On the contrary, when a vassal rebelled he had only to send letters to his sovereign renouncing all further allegiance and bidding him defiance, in which case he was no longer a traitor but an open enemy, and might even slay the king should the opportunity be within his reach. Such was the argument of Sir Robert Graham, a man well versed in the laws of Scotland, when he was placed upon his trial for the assassination of James I. By letters under his hand he had disclaimed the king's authority and proclaimed himself the mortal enemy of James, upon whom he would inflict his worst; and after this he thought himself justified in striking down the king even within the sacred precincts of a monastery. His judges might therefore slay him in return, now that the opportunity was theirs; but to torture him as well as put him to death was a stretch of tyranny which the law of Scotland could not justify.

These restrictions upon the regal authority lead us to a consideration of that feudalism by which they were imposed. In England the nobility established over the country by William were Norman conquerors, whose lands and privileges were the rewards of violence and oppression; and the people, who continued to regard them as strangers and as enemies, thought themselves entitled to recover their own lost rights as soon as they were strong enough for the purpose. Hence the jealousy with which the English nobility were watched by the commons, and the facility with which an English sovereign could pull these temporary tyrants down when he adopted the wise policy of making himself strong in the affections of the people.

But the character as well as the origin of Scottish feudalism, was different. The founders of its noble families, although for the most part Normans also, had entered the country not as conquerors, but refugees or malcontents, and were received with that distinction which was due to their bravery, military skill, and superior civilisation. They thus became Scotland's best counsellors in peace and leaders in war, and the lands and honours which they won in the new home of their adoption were the willing awards of a grateful king and people. In this way they became not the lordly oppressors, but the fathers and

[¹ But in Scotland the crown was possessed of very little power, and the king could scarce be considered as more than the first baron of the kingdom, subject to be restrained, imprisoned, dethroned, and slain, at the pleasure of a turbulent aristocracy. It is true that when the Scottish monarch possessed the love and affection of his peers he was generally allowed considerable weight in the national councils; but the extent of his power usually rested on the degree of personal estimation in which he was held. James III was repeatedly imprisoned and finally deposed and murdered by the same class of nobles (in some instances the very same individuals) who loved, honoured, and obeyed his more popular son with such devotion that they followed him against their own better judgment to the fatal field of Flodden, in which with the flower of his kingdom he lost his life.]

[1400-1513 A.D.]

protectors of their Scottish vassals, and the feeling of devotedness towards their feudal superiors became in the hearts of the latter a downright national characteristic. Possessed of such power and surrounded by such adherents, it was no wonder if, in process of time, these nobles became envious of the regal authority and sought to repress it. This was all the more natural, as the Scottish kings, whether of the Bruce or Stuart line, had originally been nothing more than Norman nobles like themselves, and had been elevated to the throne by a lucky combination of chances. Hence the power of the Scottish nobility, and their readiness to turn it against the sovereign; so that while England had only one Leicester, and one Hotspur, and one Warwick, Scotland had a hundred.

In a country by nature so sterile, and among a people so incessantly occupied either with intestine wars or English invasions, the arts of agriculture were not likely to be well understood or even greatly cared for. A feudal lord who wished to increase his followers had only to subdivide his barren acres into roods, and the families so located had neither the means nor the stimulus to turn such miserable strips into regular, well-cultivated farms. Besides, with even more ample means the Scottish agriculturist had little inducement to plough or sow when he knew not by what hand the harvest might be gathered. When an English army crossed the border it generally drove into the heart of the kingdom, eating whatever produce it could find, and destroying what it could not use; and when the peasants returned after the invasion was over they found nothing but wasted fields and empty larders. Their only hope of present subsistence in this case arose from a counter-foray into England, with which they generally requited every inroad of the enemy, and thus they contrived to indemnify themselves for their losses among the rich corn-fields and fat pastures of Cumberland and Northumberland.

Added to these evils by which agricultural industry was checked may be mentioned the tenures upon which farms were generally held, where the leases only lasted from year to year, so that the occupant might be displaced upon a very short notice. The rent, too, was commonly paid by military service; and thus while the farmer was almost continually in harness under the banner of his lord, his fields were left to the cultivation of women, children, and villains, as villinage was still continued in Scotland after it had ceased in England. All these causes not only serve to explain the very defective state of Scottish agriculture, but might make us wonder how such a numerous population could have been supported, did we not call to mind how heavily the whole English border was taxed by the hungry stomachs of their northern antagonists.

Pasturage rather than tillage, indeed, formed the main dependence of the Scots, as this required little labour, while the cattle, in the event of an inroad, could be driven to the hills and fastnesses. But if the miseries of famine were so destructive in England, with all its industry and abundance, we may conceive what such visitations were in Scotland, whose inhabitants even at the best were generally confined to scanty rations. Conscious of the prevalent national defect and anxious to assimilate his native country to the improved state of England, James I endeavoured to amend its agriculture, but this, too, was by act of parliament, for which his subjects little cared. By this act every farmer having a plough and eight oxen was required to sow annually a firlot of wheat, half a firlot of pease, and *forty* beans, under a penalty of ten shillings; and every baron to sow a like quantity upon his own ground, under a forfeiture of four times the sum.

Besides destroying peaceful industry by converting the peasantry into soldiers the wars with England created more than one class of society, by

which the progress of Scottish civilisation was heavily retarded. And first of these we should mention the moss-troopers, men who lived upon the border and were therefore exposed to the first brunt of every onset. As they were thus the outposts of a hostile encampment they were, by birth, necessity, habit, and inclination, soldiers and nothing else; men who lived by English plunder and generally died upon an English gallows, if they were not so fortunate as to die in harness and upon the battle-field. Sometimes, also, when English plunder was not so abundant or so easily reached, they betook themselves to what they modestly called "a little shifting for their living," and robbed the pasturages or granaries of their own inland countrymen as readily as those of the Southrons, of whom they were the born and sworn enemies.

But besides these moss-troopers, who were amenable to the border laws and subject to the rule of the border wardens, there were the broken clans composed of communities settled upon those portions of the border usually called Debatable land. These men, who had lost their feudal lords as well as their native homes, and been driven hither and thither by the continual shifting of the boundary line between the two kingdoms, at length came to regard both as their natural enemies, and robbed either indiscriminately, while it was difficult to follow them into their fastnesses, or drive them from their strongholds.

A less formidable, but equally pernicious class, whom the wars with England tended to create, were the sturdy beggars, otherwise called "sorners" or "gaberlunzies," who multiplied in Scotland to an incredible extent. These, too, were not exclusively composed of the lowest of society; on the contrary, many of them either were, or pretended to be, men of gentle birth, although impoverished in their circumstances; and upon the strength of their honourable descent they pursued their humble vocation, not in rags and with a piteous whine, but with horses, hawks, and attendants, so that where they could not obtain admission in virtue of their high-sounding names, they were able to enforce it by storm or onslaught.

These jackdaws, however, were often detected, stripped of their borrowed plumes, and driven forth to herd with their own kind. But still, beggary continued to thrive on account of that mistaken hospitality which would allow no one to pass the door as well as that craving for news which is always strongest in a divided and thinly peopled country, so that Scotland remained pre-eminently a land of sturdy beggars until they dwindled into the Blue-gowns and Edie Ochiltrees of the close of the eighteenth century.

WAR CUSTOMS

While such were the consequences which the wars of the two rival countries entailed upon Scotland on account of its being by far the weaker and the poorer, the war usages and customs of the Scots demand our consideration, as these constituted a large portion of the every-day life of the people. This subject, however, is so fully explained in the history of their military achievements that it may be dismissed with a brief notice. The training and customs of chivalry among them were of the same kind that prevailed not only in England but over Europe; and the country produced such stalwart knights as England or Europe could seldom have overmatched. There was little, however, of tournament practice in Scotland owing to the poverty of the people and their constant occupation in the realities of war, although its

[1400-1513 A.D.]

knights, when summoned to the trial, could back a war-horse and couch a lance as skilfully as the best.

One favourite weapon of these champions was the axe, which, notwithstanding its unwieldiness, they could handle, according to Froissart,^b with wonderful dexterity, and deal with it such strokes that, according to the great chronicler's favourite phrase, "it was a pleasure to behold them." Of this, indeed, the encounter of Bruce at Bannockburn with De Bohun was a sufficient testimony. While tournaments were seldom held in Scotland, single combats, either judicial or from private feud, were of almost constant occurrence and were fought out on horseback with the lance or on foot with the two-handed sword, or axe and dagger.

As in the wars between the English and Scots the former were generally the assailants, their favourite weapon, the longbow, was well fitted for such a purpose; while the Scots, who stood on the defensive, and generally fought on foot, preferred the spear eighteen feet in length with which they stood shoulder to shoulder, presenting such a bristly array that neither cavalry could easily break through their ranks, nor infantry reach them. This was well when matters came to a close hand-to-hand engagement in which the Scots were generally the victors; but when the English, on the other hand, depended upon their archery and contented themselves with a distant fight, it was then

"Alas, alas for Scotland
When England's arrows fly!"

It was singular that the Scots profited so little by the lesson which Bruce gave them at Bannockburn when he let loose among the English archers a small body of mounted men-at-arms who quickly cut them down or drove them back upon the main army; and thus their defeats were generally caused by those fatal shafts to which their serried ranks offered an easy and unresisting mark.¹

The Scots, indeed, were not wholly without archers; but these were generally Highlanders or Islesmen, whom the Lowlanders heartily hated; and their bows of four feet long, where the string was only drawn to the breast, could not send an arrow with the same distant range and deadly force that were given to the "cloth-yard shaft." The Scottish kings, especially James I and James II, anxious to make their subjects a full match in every kind of conflict to their enemies, endeavoured to introduce among them the longbow and the careful apprenticeship which it required, and accordingly the popular out-door sports were prohibited. Every male above the age of twelve was to practise archery, and butts were to be erected at every village church at which every man was to shoot at least six arrows each holiday, while the defaulter was to forfeit two-pence as drink-money to those who gave regular attendance. But the Scots, still more impatient of such coercion than their rivals had ever been, chose rather to be shot with English arrows than learn to requite them, and accordingly the spear of six ells long which needed little beyond a stout heart and steady hand continued to be the favourite and national weapon, until, like the English bow, it was superseded by hagbut, arquebuse, and matchlock, and better still, by the bayonet.

As war was of necessity so much the occupation of the Scots, the war-laws were sufficiently numerous. These chiefly regarded border inroads and the

[¹ The superiority of the English in archery cannot be better expressed than by the Scottish proverb, that each southern archer bore at his belt the lives of twenty-four Scots, such being the number of arrows with which he was usually supplied.—SCOTT.]

division of plunder—matters, as we have seen, of paramount importance in the military operations of the country. As invasions also from England were so frequent and sudden the system of war-signals in Scotland was brought even at an early period to a considerable state of improvement. The laws of James II in this respect were well suited to the requirement. All the fords and passages of the Tweed by which the English could cross were to be carefully watched, and bale-fires or beacons to be established at each to give notice of the coming enemy. From Hume Castle, the nearest point, these signals were taken up and transmitted to Edgerton; from Edgerton they passed to Soutra Edge, and thence to Dunbar, Haddington, Dalkeith, Edinburgh, and the Lothians, so that in a few hours the most populous districts could be warned and in readiness over the whole kingdom.

The military muster, from a band to a numerous army, according to the nature of the warning, could be effected with almost equal promptitude, as every peasant was a trained soldier, bound to repair to the banner of his feudal landlord, and more or less completely armed, according to the amount of land he held in fee. All these points were minutely specified by laws, which were as familiar as household words, and every man knew his place and duty, however sudden might be the summons. The campaign, however, was necessarily a short one, as each soldier carried his own provisions, and these only for forty days at the utmost; and hence the impatience of the Scottish armies to decide the contest at once and by a pitched battle, although against more numerous and better-armed antagonists.

The case, however, was different when the war was carried into England, for there the Scottish soldier's little bag of oatmeal could be replaced from the well-stored girdles and abundant stalls of the south with richer fare; in which he revelled with a zest for which his previous short commons had fully prepared him. When the English viands were thus found, the ingenuity of military Scottish cookery was by no means wanting, for the bullock's hide supplied not only a regimental caldron for boiling the carcass, but shoes for the march, while the animal's horns sufficed for trumpets to cheer the invaders on the way or sound to the onset.

A Douglas was usually accompanied by twelve hundred followers, practised in battle and armed to the teeth, while the trains of the chief nobility were scarcely inferior. This was all the more necessary when each had a score of feuds on his hands, and might have as many encounters in a journey from Jedburgh to Holyrood. While the habitations and style of living among the noblest was so rude and uncomfortable, notwithstanding the external pomp and glitter of feudal authority with which they were surrounded, the condition of the commons corresponded with that of their lords.

Such was the case especially in the reign of James I, when Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II, made an adventurous visit into Scotland. Upon the borders he found that most of the houses were not even huts, as they were generally a small breast-work composed of mud, or such materials as were at hand, and raised to a sufficient height by three or four poles meeting a-top, and covered with straw or turf; while those of the villages were little better, and had no door but a cow's hide suspended at the entrance. As for the towns, the houses were generally built of wood, but if of stone then lime was omitted.

This will sufficiently explain the cause of so little domestic architecture being indicated in Scotland previous to the sixteenth century except in the ruins of strong castles that either defied every attack or were thought not worth the trouble of demolition. From the border to the metropolis no one thought of building a costly edifice which a single hour of foreign invasion or domestic

[1400-1513 A.D.]

feud might level to the ground. That neither the will nor the ability, however, was wanting, was sufficiently attested by the stately cathedrals and monasteries that towered above the huts of their builders, and upon which all the resources of architecture were expended in the hope that their sacredness would be respected by a Christian foe. But the feeling of the Macedonian conqueror was wanting, and therefore, while temple and tower went to the ground, the "house of Pindarus" would not have been spared. The noble ruins of Kelso, Jedburgh, Melrose, and Dryburgh abbeys, are melancholy monuments of what Scotland might have achieved in architecture, had not the battle for national independence occurred to task all her energies as well as exhaust all her resources.

THE UNIVERSITIES

Hitherto the few learned men that Scotland produced had been indebted for their acquirements to the universities of England or France, but at last, in the fifteenth century, the country was provided with colleges of its own. The first of these was the university of St. Andrews erected by its bishop, Henry Wardlaw. This eminent individual, who was appointed to the Scottish primacy in 1404, while he was residing in the papal court at Avignon, found, on his return to his native country, everything in a confusion that was soon after deepened by the death of Robert III, the capture and imprisonment of the young prince, afterwards James I, and the usurpation of the duke of Albany.

Wardlaw first formed an association at St. Andrews of such scholars as the country then possessed, who gave lectures upon the subjects that were usually taught at colleges—divinity, logic, physics, and the canon and civil laws. In this way, having established the reality of a university without the name, his next step was to invest it with a charter or grant of privileges, which he did in 1411; and two years afterwards these privileges were confirmed by six papal bulls sent by Benedict XIII, which were received in St. Andrews with the ringing of bells, the lighting of bonfires, and every demonstration of popular triumph. James I on his return from captivity fostered the rising institution, which at length comprised thirteen doctors of divinity and eight doctors of laws as its teachers, while the students amounted to several thousands.

At first the professors had no fixed salaries and the students paid no fees, while the only building for the delivery of lectures was a large wooden edifice called the pedagogy. But in 1455 James Kennedy, the successor of Wardlaw, built and endowed the college of St. Salvator. The injunctions laid upon the ecclesiastics while they attended college give us a strange idea of the morals of the Scottish clergy of this period. They were to live decently according to their sacred calling, "so as not to keep concubines *publicly*, nor to be common night-walkers or robbers, or habitually guilty of other notorious crimes." Was it in consequence of these restrictions that so few of the clergy availed themselves of a university so expressly founded for their benefit? At all events, nothing is more certain than that while the laity were eager to improve themselves by its instructions the priesthood stood aloof or opposed it. But poetical justice requited them in the following century for their criminal remissness, for it was chiefly from this university that the Reformation issued, before which they were swept away.

The next Scottish establishment of the kind was the University of Glasgow, founded by William Turnbull. This ecclesiastic having been appointed bishop of that see in 1448, addressed himself to the erection of a college in

[1400 A.D.]

that city, and obtained a bull to that effect from Nicholas V at the beginning of 1450. In order still further to aggrandise the institution, which commenced its labours in 1451, the bull granted a universal indulgence to all faithful Christians who should visit the cathedral of Glasgow during that year.

As in the case of St. Andrews the course of study and form of government were modelled upon those of the university of Paris. Both of these Scottish colleges instead of being monastic institutions where the students were lodged within the walls and supported at a common table, were rather great academies composed of class-rooms which the students attended daily during the prescribed hours. This was all in the way of education that so poor a country as Scotland was able in the first instance to accomplish.^f

The Scottish parliaments were so much impressed with the necessity of education that in 1494 they passed a remarkable edict by which each baron and substantial freeholder was enjoined, under the penalty of twenty pounds, to send his eldest son to the grammar school at six, or at the utmost nine years of age. Having been competently grounded in Latin the pupils were directed to study three years in the schools of philosophy and law to qualify themselves for occupying the situation of sheriffs, justices of the peace, and other judges in ordinary.

That this singular statute had considerable influence we cannot doubt; yet the historian Mair or Major* still continued to upbraid the nobility of his time with gross neglect of their children's education. But though a majority may have contemned literature and its pursuits in comparison with the sports of the field or the exercises of war, there were so many who availed themselves of the opportunities of education as to leave a splendid proof of their proficiency. Dunbar, the Chaucer of Scotland, has in his *Lament for the Death of the Makers* enumerated eighteen poets of eminence in their time, who flourished from the earlier half of the fifteenth century down to the reign of James V. Many of their poems which have been preserved attest the skill and taste of the authors; but the genius of Dunbar and Gawain Douglas alone is sufficient to illuminate whole centuries of ignorance. In Latin composition, the names of Bishop Elphinstone, John Major or Mair, Patrick Paulner, secretary to James IV, and Hector Boece, or Boetius (an excellent scholar, though a most inaccurate and mendacious historian), attest the progress of Scottish literature.^g

POETRY

While Scotland was not more distinguished than England had been during this period for men of high attainment in literature and science, the case was different in poetry; for in this respect Scotland has names to offer with which her more richly endowed rival was unable to compete. The first as well as the most distinguished was James I, that minstrel king whose poetical history was as romantic as his political career, but without the same stormy troubles or melancholy termination.

He became a poet scarcely inferior to Chaucer himself, who was his model; and his principal poem, entitled the *King's Quhair* or Quair (*i.e.*, quire or book), is the only work in English worthy of being placed by the side of the *Canterbury Tales*. Several other poetical works have been attributed to him, but from their character and style they were more likely to have been the productions of James V, his talented descendant.

Another distinguished Scottish poet of this period was Henry the Minstrel, better known among the people at large by the homely epithet of Blind Harry. Of his personal history there is little known except that he belonged

[1513 A.D.]

to that class now prescribed in Scotland among the *vagabondis, iuilis, and sic like idill peopill*; that he recited his ballads from house to house for a living, and that he was born blind. All this gave little promise of the celebrity he was afterwards to acquire among his countrymen. But happily he hit upon a popular theme, which was the life and adventures of Sir William Wallace, the almost worshipped national hero, which he must have composed between the years 1470 and 1480; and the materials of the work, he informs us, were chiefly derived from the *Life of Wallace*, written in Latin by John Blair, the chaplain of the hero, and amplified by Thomas Graye. In classical refinement, depth of reflection, and historical fidelity, the poem of *Wallace* cannot stand comparison with Barbour's *Bruce*; but as a spirit-stirring narrative as well as descriptive epic it is greatly superior to that of the philosophical arch-deacon; so that while the latter work was chiefly confined to the reflective few, the former obtained a universal acceptance among the peasantry of Scotland, whom it roused and animated in the great struggle for national independence. In this way the blind minstrel became the Homer of his country. Even, too, when his language had become all but a dead letter to common readers, and when Barbour was almost forgotten, the poetical fame of Henry suffered little diminution, as his *Wallace* was faithfully modernised by William Hamilton of Gilbertfield, the friend and correspondent of Allan Ramsay, and in this condition continues to be a favourite in almost every cottage of Scotland.

A third Scottish poet, but of a different character from the preceding, was Robert Henryson or Henderson, of whose life little is known except that he was chief schoolmaster of Dunfermline during the fifteenth century. Classical and elegant in taste and refined in language, his poetry is a complete contrast to the rough, trumpet-like strains of Blind Harry, as well as his favourite themes, which were chiefly recommendatory of peacefulness, purity, and religious contemplation.

He wrote a collection of fables, thirteen in number, also the tale of *Orpheus*, founded on the old classical story, and the *Bludy Serk*, an allegorical tale in which the highest doctrines of Christianity are impersonated in the adventures of a young prince freeing a king's daughter from captivity. But the best-known of his works are the *Testament of Cresseid*, written as a sequel to Chaucer's *Troilus and Cresseide*, and *Robene and Makyne*, the earliest pastoral poem written in the English language.

The poetical merits of Henryson are thus justly summed up by P. F. Tytler:¹ "Of the works of this remarkable man it is difficult, when we consider the period in which they were written, to speak in terms of too warm encomium. In strength and sometimes even in sublimity of painting, in pathos and sweetness, in the variety and beauty of his pictures of natural scenery, in the vein of quiet and playful humour which runs through many of his pieces, and in that fine natural taste which, rejecting the faults of his age, has dared to think for itself, he is altogether excellent."

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS

A few notices remain to be added respecting the history of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland. The clergy of that kingdom, or some of them, are spoken of under their ancient name of Culdees, as we have previously seen, down to so late a period as the close of the thirteenth century. The earliest historical record of any interference with Scotland on the part of the Romish pontiffs is that of the appearance in the country of John of Crema as papal legate

in 1126; but we are scarcely entitled thence to assume, as has sometimes been done, that the papal supremacy over the Scottish church was then for the first time asserted or admitted. Little can be inferred from the silence of history upon a particular point in a period of which scarcely anything that can be properly called history has come down to us. Some other circumstances, however, make it appear probable that if any dependence upon Rome was so much as formally acknowledged by the early Scottish church it was practically all but or altogether unfelt. The mere remoteness and barbarous condition of the country would secure its being left very much to itself. But long before the commencement of the present period, the ecclesiastical establishment of Scotland had become completely assimilated, in the general outline of its constitution, to the other churches of the Latin world.

The history of the Scottish church in the fifteenth century, so far as it can now be recovered, consists principally of the enumeration of a series of provincial councils whose acts, reported as they are, contain little or nothing of much interest.

The following passage from Pinkerton^m gives in brief compass a comprehensive view of the state of the Scottish church at this period: "The privileges of the church seem to have been an exemption from tribute and war and from the sentence of a temporal judge; a judicial authority in the spiritual causes of tithes, testaments, matrimonial and heretical affairs; freedom to let lands and tithes; submission to no foreign church, but to the pope alone; a power of holding provincial councils for the regulation of the national church.

"In benefices the pontiff had only the right of confirmation and deprivation, and the purchase of any benefice at Rome was strictly prohibited. (By an act of parliament passed in 1471, the procurement of any benefices from the court of Rome, other than those anciently at the disposal of the pope, was declared to be a crime punishable with the pains of treason.) The bishops were elected by the chapter, and the royal recommendation seems seldom to have intervened. Abbots were chosen by the monks alone; the secular clergy were named by the proprietors of the lands. These clergy were either parsons (rectors) or vicars. Many were in the appointment of the bishops and of collegiate bodies whose chapters they formed. Hence the lay patronage was much confined. Many sees and abbeyes were opulent, but James III seems to have been the first monarch who seized and made a traffic of the nomination."

The religious zeal of the age expended itself upon the same objects in Scotland as in England. Whithern, in Galloway, appears to have been the most noted Scottish pilgrimage. St. Treignan, repeatedly mentioned by Rabelais as the name of a Scottish saint, is supposed to be a corruption of St. Ninian, the founder of the bishopric of Whithern. The new doctrines, however, penetrated to the northern part of the island very soon after they made their appearance in the south. The first propagators appear to have come from England—whether seeking a refuge from the active inquisition after heresy which had begun in that kingdom, or, as is more likely, ambitious of exercising the apostleship of the truth in a new land.

In the year 1408 John Resby, an English priest, was apprehended as a Wycliffite, as we have seen, and was burned at Perth along with his books and writings—being, as far as is known, the first person who thus suffered in Scotland. The example, like that of the similar execution of Sawtre in England a few years before, appears to have been considered sufficient to strike terror into the popular mind for some time. The second Scottish martyrdom did not take place till the year 1433, when Paul Crawar, a Bohemian phy-


[1400-1513 A.D.]

sician, was burned at St. Andrews on the 23rd of July. It is lamentable to have to add that both these executions also took place during the primacy of Bishop Henry Wardlaw, the venerated founder of the first Scottish university.

Although no person is recorded to have been brought to the stake for heresy in the space of nearly thirty years that elapsed between the executions of Resby and Crawar, it is certain, nevertheless, that the new opinions obtained an extensive diffusion in Scotland during that interval. This is evident from the accounts of the trial of the Bohemian, who is spoken of as an emissary to a numerous body sharing the sentiments of himself and his countrymen.

The growth of Lollardism may also be inferred from a statute that had been passed for its suppression by the parliament that assembled immediately after the return of James I from England in 1421. Bower," the continuator of Fordun, who wrote some years after the second of the two executions that have been mentioned, tells us that there were still in his day some unhappy persons, instigated by the devil, by whom Resby's writings were secretly preserved, and their pernicious heresies cherished, in accordance with the scriptural text that "stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant."

The most important event that happened during the present period in the history of the Scottish ecclesiastical establishment was the erection of the see of St. Andrews into an archbishopric by Pope Sixtus IV in 1471. This measure was resorted to in consequence of the renewal by Nevil, archbishop of York, of the old claim of his see to supremacy over the kingdom of Scotland. The papal bull declared it to be an unfitting thing that an English prelate should be primate of Scotland, and ordained all the rest of the Scottish bishops, twelve in number, to be henceforth subject to St. Andrews.'





CHAPTER X

JAMES V AND MARY STUART

[1513-1567 A.D.]

There have been more rebellions in Scotland than in any other country; and the rebellions have been very sanguinary, as well as very numerous. The Scotch have made war upon most of their kings, and put to death many. To mention their treatment of a single dynasty they murdered James I and James III. They rebelled against James II and James VII. They laid hold of James V and placed him in confinement. Mary they immured in a castle, and afterwards deposed. Her successor, James VI, they imprisoned; they led him captive about the country, and on one occasion attempted his life. Towards Charles I they showed the greatest animosity, and they were the first to restrain his mad career. Three years before the English ventured to rise against that despotic prince the Scotch boldly took up arms and made war on him. The service which they then rendered to the cause of liberty it would be hard to overrate; but the singular part of the transaction was, that having afterwards got possession of the person of Charles they sold him to the English for a large sum of money, of which they, being very poor, had pressing need. Such a sale is unparalleled in history.—BUCKLE.^b

THE MINORITY OF JAMES V

THE alarm which followed upon the melancholy event of the field of Flodden through the whole kingdom of Scotland was universal and appalling; but fortunately those who had to direct the energies of the state under circumstances so adverse were composed of a metal competent to the task. The commissioners who exercised the power of the magistracy of Edinburgh, for the lord provost and magistrates in person had accompanied the king to the fatal field, set a distinguished example of resolution. A proclamation is extant in which, speaking of the misfortune of the king and his host as a rumour of which there was yet no certainty, they appointed the females of respectability to pass to church, those of the lower rank to forbear clamouring and shrieking in the streets, and all men capable of bearing arms to take

[1513-1514 A.D.]

their weapons and be ready on the first tolling of the great bell of the city to attend upon the magistrates, and contribute to the defence of the town. It is the language of Rome when Hannibal was at the gates.

The victorious English were, therefore, expected to appear shortly before the walls of the metropolis; but Surrey's army had been summoned together for defending their own frontier, not for the invasion of Scotland. The crown vassals did not remain in the field after their term of service had been rendered: and though the victory was gained, yet a loss of at least four thousand men had thinned the ranks of the conquerors.

A general council of the Scottish nobles' was convoked at Perth (October, 1513) to concert what national measures ought to be adopted for the government of the kingdom at this exigency. The number of the nobles who gave attendance was few, and the empty seats and shortened roll gave melancholy evidence of the extent of the late loss. The queen was readily admitted to the regency, a compliment which might be intended to conciliate her brother Henry. It had not that effect. Letters arrived from France by which the king of England strictly commanded and fiercely urged that the success at Flodden should be followed up by repeated inroads upon the Scottish frontiers, where a desolating though indecisive war was maintained accordingly.

Driven to despair by the severity of Henry, the Scottish council began to look towards France and to turn their eyes to a prince of the blood-royal now resident there, and next heir to the crown of Scotland, had James IV died childless. This was John duke of Albany, son of that Alexander duke of Albany who was brother to James III, and who having been declared a traitor for attaching himself to England had ended his days in France. To this duke John a strong party in Scotland proposed to assign the regency, which they wished no longer to intrust with a female and an Englishwoman, sister to a monarch who used his success so unsparingly. Whatever efforts might have been made to support Margaret in the office to which the king's will had admitted her, they became unavailing by her marrying, August 6th, 1514, the earl of Angus as soon as she had recovered from her confinement, in which she bore a posthumous child to James IV, April 30th, 1514. A marriage so soon after the death of her royal husband was prejudicial to her reputation, and as it placed her personally under the control of a subject rendered her incapable of holding and exercising the sovereign power of regent.

In some respects, indeed, her choice could not be amended. Earl Archibald of Angus was grandson and successor to him whom we have so often distinguished by the name of Bell-the-Cat. His father and uncle had fallen at Flodden; his aged grandfather had carried his sorrows for Scotland, and for his own loss of two gallant sons, into the shade of religious retirement. This young man, therefore, was at the head of the second branch of the house of Douglas, which had risen to a degree of power destined once more to make their sovereign tremble. Angus was also all that could win a lady's eye; he was splendid in attire, retinue, and housekeeping; handsome, brave, and active. But he had the faults of his family, being ambitious and desirous of power; and he had those of his youth, being headlong and impetuous in his passions, wild and unrestrained in his conduct. He did not pay the queen who was some years older than himself that deference which Margaret might have expected from decorum if not from affection, and at best was a negligent and faithless husband. His ambition aspired to maintain his wife's claims to the regency, although forfeited, as already said, by her second marriage.

[¹ The infant king had been crowned twelve days after Flodden—i.e., on September 21st, 1513.]

THE REGENCY OF ALBANY

But the preferable claim of Albany was maintained by the Scottish nobility, who asserted the right of the next in succession to rule the kingdom during the minority of the monarch. The right of this prince to the chief government was in an especial manner supported by the earl of Arran, head of the house of Hamilton. This powerful nobleman, waiving some pretensions which he himself might have made to the regency, added great weight to that party which pleaded the rights of Albany. The duke of Albany came over to Scotland accordingly and was installed as regent on May 17th, 1515. On May 15th the lingering war with England was put an end to by the inclusion of Scotland in the peace which had been agreed upon betwixt France and that country the August preceding.

Albany obtained an order from the parliament that the royal children should be delivered up to him. Margaret, after a vain resistance, was compelled to place the infant king and his short-lived brother Alexander under the suspicious care of an aspiring kinsman; and her husband Angus hastened to the border to consult with Lord Hume upon some means of withstanding the oppressive severity of the regent's government. Albany, however, was powerful enough to disconcert all their measures, even though Arran, deserting the regent's party, was so mutable as to make common cause with Hume. The queen-mother, far advanced in her pregnancy, was driven into England, where she was delivered of a female infant [afterwards Lady Lennox, mother of Darnley], in the miserable turret of a Northumbrian baron, from which she afterwards took refuge in her brother's court. The circumstance, however, of having been born in England was of considerable advantage to the lady Margaret Douglas in calculating her proximity to the English crown.

Meantime the regent became unpopular. The younger of the two Scottish princes died in his custody, not without foul suspicion of neglect or poison, and the king's person was taken from his custody and placed in the hands of certain select peers to whose loyalty he might be safely intrusted. The regent found his power restricted, and obtained or extorted the permission of the estates to pay a visit to France, June 7th, 1517. At the same time, although the duke's name was retained as regent, the real power was lodged in a council, in which Angus having now returned to Scotland held a seat. His wife, Queen Margaret, was received back with all due honour, and there seemed reason to think that something like a steady government was at length formed.

DOUGLAS AGAINST HAMILTON

The peace of the kingdom was disturbed by a constant dissension betwixt the parties of Hamilton and Douglas, in other words, between the earls of Angus and Arran. They used arms against each other without hesitation. At length, January, 1520, a parliament being called at Edinburgh, the earl of Angus appeared with four hundred of his followers armed with spears. The Hamiltons, not less eager and similarly prepared for strife, repaired to the capital in equal or superior numbers. They assembled in the house of the chancellor Beaton, the ambitious archbishop of Glasgow, who was bound to the faction of Arran by that nobleman having married the prelate's niece.

Gavin Douglas, bishop of Dunkeld, a son of Earl Bell-the-Cat and the celebrated translator of Vergil, laboured to prevent the factions from coming

[1520-1521 A.D.]

to blows. He applied to Beaton himself, as official conservator of the laws and peace of the realm. Beaton laying his hand upon his heart protested upon his conscience he could not help the affray which was about to take place. "Ha! my lord," said the advocate for peace, who heard a shirt of mail rattle under the bishop's rochet, "methinks your conscience clatters." The bishop of Dunkeld then had recourse to Sir Patrick Hamilton, brother to the earl of Arran, who willingly attempted to exhort his kinsmen to the preservation of peace, until he was rudely upbraided with reluctance to fight by Sir James Hamilton, natural son to his brother and a man of a fierce and sanguinary disposition. "False bastard!" said Sir Patrick, in wrath, "I will fight to-day where thou dardest not be seen."

There were now no more thoughts of peace, and the Hamiltons, with their western friends and allies, rushed in fury up the lanes which lead from the Cowgate where the bishop's palace was situated, intending to take possession of the High street. But the Douglasses had been beforehand with them and already occupied the principal street with the advantage of attacking their enemies as they issued in disorder from the narrow closes or lanes. Such of Angus' followers also as had not lances were furnished with them by the favour of the citizens of Edinburgh who handed them over their windows.

The Hamiltons were driven out of the city leaving upwards of seventy men dead, one of whom was Sir Patrick Hamilton, the advocate for peace. The earl of Arran and his natural son were so far endangered that meeting a collier's horse, they were fain to throw off its burden, and both mounting the same miserable animal, they escaped through a ford in the loch which then defended the northern side of the city.

The consequences of this skirmish, which according to the humour of the age was long remembered by the name of "Cleanse the Causeway," raised Angus for a little time to the head of affairs. But unable to reacquire the lost affection of his wife, the queen-dowager, the latter in her aversion to her husband and resentment of his infidelities and neglects joined in soliciting the return of Albany, an event which took place November 19th, 1521. Angus and his party, alarmed at his arrival and remembering the fate of the Lord Hume and his brother, made a precipitate retreat from Edinburgh and took refuge in England.^c

ALBANY'S SECOND REGENCY AND FAILURE (1521-1523 A.D.)

Albany thus once more reinstated, after an interval of five years, in the precarious honour of the regency, ordained a parliament to meet within a short period at Edinburgh, and fulminated a citation against the Douglasses to appear in that assembly and reply to the weighty charges to be brought against them; but although determined to put down with a firm hand these enemies of the state, the regent was anxious for peace with England.

The principles of his government, of which the venality of the Scottish nobles and the intrigues of Dacre, the minister of Henry, alone prevented the development, were to maintain the ancient independence of Scotland, and whilst he dismissed all dreams of conquest or glory, to resist that secret influence by which the English monarch, for his own ambitious designs, sought to govern a kingdom in whose administration he had no title to interfere.

The means by which he sought to accomplish these ends were, to reunite the discordant elements of the Scottish aristocracy, to persuade the queen-mother that her interests and those of her son, the king, were one and the same, and to open immediately a diplomatic correspondence with England,

in which he trusted to convince that power of the uprightness and sincerity of his intentions.

But the difficulties which presented themselves even on the threshold of his schemes were great. Dacre, one of the ablest diplomatists in the profligate political school of Henry VIII, had no intentions of renouncing the hold he had so long maintained for his master over the Scottish affairs; he reckoned with confidence on the impetuous temper and capricious affections of the queen dowager, he was familiar with the venality of the nobles, and he knew that the means he possessed of disturbing the government were many and powerful.

It is unfortunate that the principal original records which remain of these troubled times are so completely the composition of partisans and so contradictory of each other that to arrive at the truth is a matter of no small difficulty. But in examining the impetuous measures adopted by Henry VIII, the violent accusations against the government of Albany which proceeded from Dacre and the bishop of Dunkeld, and the animated, though partial defence of his and her own conduct which is given by the queen, it is clear, we think, that the views presented of the character of the regent by Pinkerton^d and some later writers are unjust and erroneous.^e

Henry VIII seemed resolved on a war with France and Scotland; he denounced his own sister as Albany's paramour and demanded the regent's expulsion from Scotland. The Scottish parliament declined with dignity, and Henry issued an order of confiscation and exile against all Scotch and French subjects in England. He sent the earl of Shrewsbury across the borders and he burned the district of Kelso before he could be driven back, while English ships ravaged the Forth. Albany raised an army of eighty thousand and advanced to the borders, where Dacre persuaded him to a truce for a month and the disbandment of his force, an act which some Scotch historians regard as cowardly, though Tytler^e defends it as a wise step.

The queen now turned against the regent and entered into correspondence with Dacre. Seeing himself so distrusted Albany obtained permission to visit France for ten months. Border warfare went on and Surrey burned the ancient and beautiful monastery at Jedburgh in pure vandalism. This brought Albany back to Scotland with a fleet of eighty-seven small ships and an army of five thousand French. Parliament ordered a mustering of all troops for October 20th, 1523, and a total of forty thousand was arrayed. Albany advanced to the borders, but found that the nobles were unwilling to proceed. He turned to Wark Castle in which the French bravely opened a breach; the Scotch refusing to support him, he was compelled to withdraw.^a

While these events occurred, however, Surrey concentrated his army and advanced with speed. The news of his speedy approach confirmed the Scottish nobles in their determination not to risk a battle. So completely had the majority of them been corrupted by the money and intrigues of Dacre and the queen dowager, that Albany did not venture to place them in the front, but, on his march, formed his vanguard of the French auxiliaries; a proceeding rendered the more necessary by the discovery of some secret machinations amongst the peers for delivering him, if he persisted in urging hostilities, into the hands of the enemy.

To attempt to encounter Surrey with his foreign auxiliaries alone would have been the extremity of rashness, and to abide the advance of the English earl with an army which refused to fight must have exposed him to discomfiture and dishonour: under such circumstances the regent, whose personal courage and military experience had been often tried on greater fields, adopted

[1523-1524 A.D.]

or rather had forced upon him the only feasible plan which remained. At the head of his artillery and foreign auxiliaries, the single portion of the army which had behaved with spirit, he retreated to Eccles, a monastery six miles distant from Wark; and little able or anxious to conceal his contempt for those nobles who, almost in the presence of the enemy, had acted with so much faithlessness and pusillanimity, he permitted them to break up and disperse amid a tempest of snow—carrying to their homes the first intelligence of their own dishonour.

Such was the result of that remarkable expedition which Pinkerton,^d whose opinion has been formed upon imperfect evidence, has erroneously represented as reflecting the utmost disgrace upon the courage and conduct of Albany. When carefully examined we must arrive at an opposite conclusion. The retreat of Albany is only one other amongst many facts which establish the venality and selfishness of the feudal aristocracy of Scotland, and the readiness with which they consented for their own private ends to sacrifice their individual honour and the welfare of the country.

On his return to the capital the governor assembled a parliament, of which the proceedings were distracted by mutual accusations and complaints. The peers accused the regent of squandering the public treasure, although the greater part of the money which he had brought from France had found its way in the shape of pensions into their own coffers, or had been necessarily laid out in the support of the foreign auxiliaries. They insisted on dismissing the French troops, and notwithstanding the inclement season of the year compelled them to embark; an ungenerous proceeding which led to the wreck of the transports on the shores of the Western Isles, and the loss of a great part of their crews.

To Albany such conduct was mortifying in the extreme; it convinced him that every effort must fail to persuade such men to adopt the only line of conduct which was likely to render the government respected, and to free the country from the dictation of England. He determined therefore, once more, to retire to France; and in a conference with the nobility requested three months' leave in which he might visit that kingdom and discover what further assistance might be expected from the French king in carrying on the war with England. His demand, after much opposition, was granted under the condition that if he did not return on the 31st of August, 1523, the league with France and his own regency should be considered as at an end.

He took an affectionate leave of his youthful sovereign and sailed for the continent, committing the chief management of affairs to the chancellor, with the bishop of Aberdeen and the earls of Huntly and Argyll. On quitting the kingdom, May 20th, 1523, Albany asserted that his absence would not exceed three months; but it is probable that his repeated reverses in a thankless office had totally disgusted him, both with Scotland and the regency, and that when he embarked it was with the resolution, which he fulfilled, of never returning to that country.^e

In this view of Albany Hume Brown^f concurs, saying that while he had been unlucky, he may be credited with having saved Scotland from English ascendancy at a period dangerous to her independence, and that the historians nearest contemporary speak kindly of him.^g

ANGUS GAINS CONTROL

The English interest once more began to predominate in the Scottish councils; for Henry VIII had again adopted his father's policy, and instead of en-

deavouring to conquer Scotland, was contented to aim at maintaining such an influence in the councils of that country as a wealthy and powerful nation may always find means of acquiring in the government of one that is poorer and weaker than herself. The present revolution seemed the more favourable to the interest of England since it raised Margaret once more to an efficient power in the Scottish government. She came from Stirling to Edinburgh, and announced that her son, James V, now a boy of twelve years old, was determined to take the sovereign power into his own hands, July 20th, 1524. A great many of the Scottish peers upon hearing this information associated themselves for protection of the young king's government, and for declaring the termination of Albany's regency.

The English king and his minister Wolsey at this crisis anxiously desired that Margaret should consent to a reconciliation with her husband Angus, but she retained a deep resentment and even detestation against her husband, and with an unmatronly levity had become enamoured of a young gentleman named Henry Stuart, second son of Andrew lord Avondale, and already entertained hopes of ridding herself of Angus by a divorce and then conferring her hand upon this younger favourite. In the mean time she raised the favoured youth to the dignity of lord treasurer of Scotland.

Angus, having determined to destroy his wife's power if he could not share it, attempted to supplant her authority, first by an escalade of the town of Edinburgh, in which he was assisted by Scott of Buccleuch and other border chiefs, and afterwards by a union with the wily and able Archbishop Beaton, with whom he effected a reconciliation and formed a party, the object of which was to free the young king from the tutelage of his mother. The struggle ended in the youthful monarch's being committed to the charge of a council of lords, the queen being allowed to preside at their sittings, a power which consisted in appearance rather than reality.

This revolution was completed, when the king, having arrived at the age of fourteen years, made choice of Angus—who had, by the most sedulous attention, obtained great influence over his mind—for administering the royal authority. But this state of things by degrees terminated in the absolute ascendancy of Angus. As some atonement to the imprudent queen for having thus expelled her from all share of power he ceased to oppose the divorce which Margaret so anxiously desired, and no sooner was it obtained (March 11th, 1527), than the royal matron hastened to wed her youthful lover, Henry Stuart, who was afterwards created Lord Methven.

The government of Angus being that of a predominant family and faction was not only universally complained of as unjust and oppressive by the country in which it was exercised, but became odious to the king also, in whose name and authority it was carried on.

This order of things could not exist long without the king making some effort to free himself from a yoke which was at once galling and degrading; but such was the state of Scotland at that period that the king's person was regarded as the symbol of the royal power; and while Angus could retain possession of James himself he cared little whether or not he possessed the royal affections. The young king, however, determined in secret to escape from him at whatever risk and entered into more than one plot for accomplishing his freedom.^c At Melrose, July 25th, 1526, Angus defeated Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch, who had set upon him with a thousand horse. Angus also vanquished the forces of Lennox, near Edinburgh, where Lennox himself was slain.^a

[1528-1530 A.D.]

JAMES V ASSUMES THE AUTHORITY

The authority of Angus became more despotic, and was stronger than ever. This ambitious earl shortly after took upon himself the office of chancellor and surrounded the king even more closely than before with his clients and dependents, whom James now felt tempted to regard as his gaolers rather than his servants. Wherever he turned his eye lighted on the dark complexion and vigilant eye of a Douglas.

In the beginning of July the king, being at Falkland, assumed the dress of a yeoman, and getting to the stables unperceived, mounted with two attendants whom he had taken into his confidence and galloped to Stirling. The governor of the strong castle which commands that town received the prince with great joy, and assured him of his personal fidelity. The king caused a solemn proclamation to be made, commanding that neither the earl of Angus nor any of his kindred should approach within six miles of the king's person under pain of high treason.

A parliament was assembled in 1528, in which Angus and his whole friends and dependents were summoned to answer for various abuses of the royal authority, and for keeping the king's person nearly two years under restraint. To defend themselves was impossible, to appear was to encounter ruin; the earl of Angus and his followers, therefore, retreated into England. Henry VIII used much intercession in the earl's favour; but it was not until the death of James that the Douglasses were restored to their native country.

In the elevation of the house of Angus to eminent power, and in its fall, there was something which resembled the rise and declension of the original house of Douglas in the reign of James II. But the second course of events were far inferior in consequence to those of the earlier revolution. The natural inference is, that since, with every advantage of a minority and a divided cabinet, with as much ambition and more talents than Douglas, Angus had neither been able to found his power so deeply nor to raise it so high; the precautions taken by James the second for repealing grants of crown-lands, for prohibiting or limiting the erection of hereditary jurisdictions, and otherwise restricting the powers of the nobility, had taken a certain though slow effect, and that James V possessed a degree of authority unknown to the Scottish princes before these restrictions undermined the power of the aristocracy. The slaughter of Flodden had tended much to reduce the numbers of the Scottish aristocracy and increase the power of the crown, to which many of their honours and estates reverted. It is owing to the influence of these joint causes that James V assumed a degree of self-agency which, in the opinion of the Scottish nobles, the monarch was hardly entitled to; that unlike his father James IV he did not seem to court their regard or employ their service, but sought his companions amongst the gentry, and his counsellors among the clergy, without for a length of time experiencing any inconvenience from the discontent of those who claimed by birth the right to share his sports and participate in the exercise of his power.

James V having obtained the unlimited exercise of the royal authority, became desirous of reducing to order the formidable border-men, who under the earl of Angus had been permitted to indulge themselves uncontrolled in all kinds of violence. The king swept through the frontiers with a flying army, reducing the castles and seizing upon the persons of those haughty chieftains, many of whom had no conception that the irregularities of which they and their people had been guilty were of a character to deserve the capital punishment of death which was unsparingly executed upon them. Having

[1531-1533 A.D.]

thus succeeded in quelling the authors of foreign strife and domestic disorder so effectually as to make "the bush of rushes keep the cow," James V proceeded to occupy the crown-lands in the counties, which had been so lately disturbed, with flocks and herds, the produce of which formed a large addition to his royal revenue on the borders.

After this signal infliction of punishment, it is boasted by a contemporary historian that the king had thirty thousand sheep pasturing in Ettrick forest, and that his herdsmen gave him as good an account of the produce, although in that disorderly district, as if they had gone within the bounds of Fife. Scotland seems to have enjoyed several years of such tranquillity as seldom occurs in the history of that distracted country.

In the year 1531 James V gave to his country of Scotland the institution of the supreme court of council and session, which was framed in imitation of the parliament of Paris. Hitherto justice had been administered by standing committees of parliament by whom the duty was irregularly and sometimes negligently discharged. These were now to give place to a court of professional persons chosen with reference to their capacity for the high office, and having no occupation which might divert them from the administration of justice. The court possessed the supreme power of decision in all civil cases, and subsists to this day under the various alterations and improvements which the experience of three centuries has suggested. The number of the judges of the new court of session was fifteen, one half of them being laymen and the others clergymen. The churchmen were taxed to defray the expense of the new establishment.

JAMES DECLINES TO JOIN HENRY VIII AGAINST ROME

In 1533 a short and unimportant war broke out with England. It was signalled only by mutual inroads on the frontiers, and ended by a peace, May 12th, 1533, between the royal uncle and nephew; after which James received from Henry the order of the Garter. At this period Henry VIII, from motives well known in history, had renounced the papal sway and became particularly anxious to induce his nephew to take a similar step. It is said that to purchase his compliance Henry would have been contented that James should become the husband of his eldest daughter Mary, with other high advantages.

But James, though desirous to be on good terms with his uncle, could not resolve upon imitating him in his scheme of throwing off the dominion of the church of Rome. The clergy who were so useful to him in the course of his administration had undoubtedly considerable influence in deterring him from following the courses of Henry. James also, though far from being wealthy, was so frugal as not to require for the support of his revenue the desperate measure of confiscating the church property. Finally, he felt that by joining with Henry in a step which all the princes of Europe held as impious and heretical he must break off his friendly connection with France and every other power, to place himself wholly in the hands of the most haughty and imperious monarch then living. He procrastinated, therefore, and evaded the proposal for a meeting.

The same reasons prevented the king from prosecuting the proposed match with the princess Mary. Meantime his people anxiously desired that he should marry. Years rolled on, and James, the last of his line, was still single. His subjects were the more anxious on this point as he often hazarded his person in private and nocturnal adventures, which he undertook sometimes

[1536-1539 A.D.]

to further the purposes of justice, and on other occasions from the love of enterprise and intrigue. A blow in a midnight brawl might have again reduced Scotland to the miserable condition of a people with whom the succession to the crown is disputed.

At length a treaty of marriage was concluded (March 29th, 1536) between the king of Scotland and Marie de Bourbon, a daughter of the duke of Vendôme. James undertook a journey to France to fetch home his betrothed bride. But when he arrived in that kingdom he was dissatisfied with the choice of his ambassador,¹ and Madeleine, the princess of France, was substituted for Marie de Bourbon. They were married in great splendour on the 1st of January, 1537, and embarked in the beginning of May for the port of Leith, in Scotland, where they were received with great rejoicings, which within forty days were to be turned into the signs of mourning. Madeleine, the young queen of Scotland, carried in her constitution the seeds of a hectic fever, which within that brief space removed her from her new kingdom and royal bridegroom, July 7th, 1537.

Her vacant place on the throne was soon afterwards filled by Mary of Guise, or of Lorraine, the most celebrated queen of Scotland, excepting her daughter, Mary Stuart, still more famed for beauty and misfortune. This lady landed in Scotland June 10th, 1538; she bore to her husband two healthy male children, both of whom died within a few days of each other during James' lifetime. Mary, the third offspring of the marriage, beheld the light for the first time at the period of her father's death in 1542.

Throughout the whole of this reign the banished Douglasses from their place of exile in England intrigued among the Scottish nobility, who saw with displeasure that the king preferred the assistance of the churchmen to theirs in the management of his political affairs. During the life of James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, the king used his approved talents in the administration; and at his death in 1539 he had called to his councils his nephew, David Beaton, afterwards cardinal and primate of Scotland. He was supposed to have been peculiarly connected with the following judicial proceedings. The son of Lord Forbes was accused of treason by the earl of Huntly, tried by the court of justiciary, and suffered death.

In like manner Jane Douglas, the sister of Angus, widow of the late Lord Glamis, mother of the youth who bore the title at the time, and wife of Archibald Campbell of Kepneith, was, with her present husband, her son, and certain accomplices, accused of and tried for an attempt to hasten the king's death by the imaginary crime of witchcraft. For this offence Lady Glamis suffered death at the stake on the castle hill of Edinburgh. She was much pitied on account of her noble birth, her distinguished grace and beauty, and the courage with which she endured her cruel punishment.

The Scottish historians throw reflections upon James for giving vent to his resentment against the Douglasses in the punishment of this lady; but her crimes appear to have been fully proved; and although the idea of taking away the life of others by acts of sorcery be now exploded, yet it is well known that in the dark ages the effect of the unhallowed rites was often accelerated by the administration of poison, not to mention that those who engaged in such a conspiracy were morally, though not actually, guilty of the crime of murder. The punishment of Lady Glamis by fire was cruel, doubtless; but the cruelty was that of the age, not of the sovereign. Her husband Campbell was killed by a fall in attempting an escape from the castle of Edinburgh in which he was a prisoner.

[¹ The chosen bride, it was said, proved to be a hunchback.]

JAMES' RESISTANCE TO THE REFORMATION

The same horrible mode of punishment undergone by Lady Glamis was during James' reign unsparingly applied to the restraint of heresy. In the year 1528 a young man of good birth, named Patrick Hamilton,¹ the first person who introduced the doctrines of Luther's reformation into Scotland, sealed them by his violent death which took place at St. Andrews. The king, being then under the tutelage of the Douglasses, cannot be charged with this act of cruelty; but the execution of seven persons in the year 1539 attested his assent to these bloody and impolitic inflictions. It is however certain, that in permitting the established laws of the realm to have their course, James by no means appeared satisfied either with the frequent repetition of such exhibitions or with the conduct of the churchmen themselves. He evinced in several particulars a bias favourable to the reformed doctrines; and his uncle, Henry VIII, confiding in these hopeful indications, continued to entertain considerable hopes of drawing over his nephew to follow his own example.

Sir Ralph Sadler, a statesman of great talent and no stranger to Scotland, was despatched with a present of some horses and the delicate task of prevailing on James to dismiss such of his ministers as were Catholic priests, especially Cardinal David Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrews, and of exhorting him at the same time to seize on the property of the church and to reform the morals of the churchmen by severe correction. The old proposal of a personal conference was again renewed.

King James answered with mildness to the urgency of his uncle. He declared that he would reform the abuses of the church, but that he could not justly or conscientiously make these a pretext for seizing on its property, especially since the churchmen were willing to supply him with such sums of money as he from time to time required. The candour of Sadler owed to his master that the king of Scotland was obliged to make use of the clergy in the public service, owing to the ignorance and incapacity of his nobility.

During all these transactions the personal character of James V appears in a favourable light. He did not, indeed, escape the charge of severity usually brought against princes who endeavour to restore the current of justice to its proper channel after it has been for some time interrupted. But his reign was distinguished by acts of personal intrepidity on the part of the sovereign, as well as by an economical and sage management of the revenues of the kingdom. James encouraged fisheries, wrought mines, cultivated waste lands, and understood and protected commerce. The palaces which he built are in a beautiful though singular style of architecture; and the productions of his mint, particularly that called the bonnet-piece, because it bears James' head surmounted by the national cap, is the most elegant specimen of gold coinage which the age affords. The sculptor of the die was probably some foreign medallist whom James had induced to settle in Scotland, and who died young. Had so excellent an artist lived for any considerable period he must have distinguished himself.

James, in proportion to his means, was liberal to foreign mechanics, by whose aid he hoped to encourage the arts among his ignorant people. The court of Scotland was gay and filled with persons of accomplishment. Himself a poet, the king gave all liberal indulgence to the Muses, and does not seem to have resented the shafts of satire which were sometimes aimed against the royal gallantries or the royal parsimony.

[¹ So John Knox credits Hamilton with starting the Reformation in Scotland.]

[1540-1541 A.D.]

With many virtues James V displayed few faults, but these were of a fatal character. The license which he gave to the vindictive persecution of the Protestants seems to have originated in that personal severity of temper already noticed. His inexorable hatred of the Douglasses partakes of the same character.

In 1540 James V undertook an expedition truly worthy of a patriotic sovereign, making, with a strong fleet and a sufficient body of troops, a circumnavigation of his whole realm of Scotland, acquainting himself with the various islands, harbours, capes, currents, and tides. In the Hebrides he took hostages from the most turbulent chiefs for the quiet behaviour of their clans, which bore in general the same denominations which they have at this day, as Macdonalds, McLeods, McLeans, Mackenzies, and others. In this expedition the king showed to the most remote part of his dominions the presence of their sovereign in a position both willing and able to support the dignity of the crown and the due administration of justice, striking a salutary terror into those heads of clans who were unwilling to acknowledge a higher authority than their own. James sailed from Leith on this praiseworthy expedition about the 22nd of May, and landed at Dumbarton in the course of July, 1540, after a voyage which in that early state of navigation was not without its dangers.

In 1541 James met with a great and poignant family affliction. The two male infants born to him by his wife, Mary of Guise, or Lorraine, were both cut off by sudden illness within a few days of each other. The Protestants recorded this as a judgment against the king for permitting the persecution of their faith, and their writers record an ominous dream of the king, in which the spectre of Sir James Hamilton [recently put to death for an alleged plot] appeared to James in the visions of the night, and striking off his two arms while he upbraided him with his cruelty, announced that he would speedily return and take his head. The superstition of Mary of Lorraine, a devoted daughter of the church of Rome, took a different direction; and the king might perhaps agree with her and the priests in concluding that their family calamity arose from the vengeance of heaven expressed against him for his slowness in extirpating heresy. At least, from the tenour of his measures at this time, such seems to have been his own interpretation of this severe visitation.

The statute-book at this period contains various severe denunciations against heresy. To argue against the pope's authority is declared punishable with death, and all discussion on the subject of religion is as far as possible prohibited. Suspected heretics are declared incapable of exercising any office;



COSTUME OF THE TIME OF JAMES V
OF SCOTLAND

may, such as may even have abjured their errors of faith are still to remain excluded from conversation with Catholics. Fugitives for their religious opinions are held as condemned; all correspondence with them is prohibited, and rewards are offered for their discovery.

These severe penal enactments sufficiently show the sense of Cardinal Beaton their author, that the Protestant opinions were penetrating deeply into Scotland, and could in his opinion only be eradicated by the most active measures. But in proportion as the severity increased the prohibited doctrines seemed to gain ground; and the Scottish clergymen saw no remedy except in the dangerous expedient of engaging James V in a war with England, the monarch of which kingdom had led the way in the great northern schism of the church.

WAR WITH HENRY VIII

The situation of James V now became extremely critical. Whatever might be the king's own moderation, there seemed almost an impossibility of his remaining neutral while France and England were hastening to a rupture; and there were weighty reasons for dreading the consequences whichever party he might embrace. If he became the close and inseparable ally of his uncle he must comply with that impetuous prince in all his humours, alter the religious constitution of his country after the example of England, confiscate the possessions of the church to the prejudice of his own ideas of religion and justice, and discharge Beaton and other counsellors by whose experienced talents he had hitherto conducted his administration.

He felt also that these sacrifices which must necessarily cost him the esteem and the alliance both of France and of Germany would be made for the chance of securing the doubtful friendship of an uncle who, amid all his professions of friendship, had constantly maintained within his kingdom the exiled family of Douglas, whom James not only peculiarly hated, but whom, from their extensive connections in Scotland, he had some reason to dread.

The king was warmly urged by a new embassy from Henry VIII to come to a decisive conclusion on these difficult points when, worn out by importunity, he gave a doubtful promise, that if the affairs of his kingdom permitted, he would meet his uncle at York for the purpose of arranging an amicable settlement. Henry, who thought highly of his own arts of eloquence and persuasion and who appears to have founded extravagant hopes on the influence which he might expect to gain by this personal interview, repaired to York and remained there for six days, expecting the arrival of King James. The king of Scotland, however, aware that to meet Henry without being prepared to concede to him everything which he desired would only precipitate a rupture, excused himself for not attending upon the conference; and Henry returned to London personally offended with James and eagerly desirous of revenge. The chastisement of the king of Scotland became now as favourite an object with Henry as the conversion of James to his own opinions on religion and politics had previously been.

At length, after a variety of petty incursions, the war broke out openly in 1542; and Sir Robert Bowes, with the banished Douglasses, entered Scotland at the head of three thousand cavalry. They were encountered near Haddonrig by the earl of Huntly, to whom James had intrusted the defence of the border. The English were defeated, and left their general and many inferior leaders prisoners in the hands of their enemies. Angus himself would have shared the same fate, but he rid himself of the knight who laid hands on him by employing his dagger.

[1542 A.D.]

James was highly encouraged by this fortunate commencement of the campaign; but he was now doomed to find that he had made shipwreck of his popularity in lending his countenance to the severities against the heretics and in excluding from his favour the nobility of the kingdom. The presence of an English army under the duke of Norfolk, which, entering the Scottish frontier, had burned the towns of Kelso and Roxburgh and nearly twenty villages, compelled him to summon an army to repel the invasion.

THE MUTINY AT FALA MOOR; SOLWAY MOSS, AND THE DEATH OF JAMES V
(1542 A.D.)

The Scottish king assembled thirty thousand men under their various feudal leaders upon the Borough moor, and marched from thence against the enemy. But as the Scottish army halted at Fala moor, they received information that the English had retired to Berwick and dismissed the greater part of their forces. The Scottish nobles on receiving this intelligence united in declaring that the occasion of their service in arms was ended, signified their intention to attend the host no longer, and prepared to depart with their respective followers.

The king was deeply grieved and irritated by this unexpected resolution. There was, however, no remedy: in a Scottish feudal camp the aristocracy were omnipotent, the king's power merely nominal; and to have urged the dispute to an open rupture would only have incurred the risk of reviving the scene of Lauder bridge in James III's time. James dismissed his refractory army when it was about to dismiss itself, and returned so deeply moved with shame and indignation that he not only lost his spirits, but his health was obviously affected.

The royal counsellors endeavoured to find a remedy for James' wounded feelings by appointing another attempt to be made against England on the western border, the success of which might, they hoped, obliterate the recollection of the mutiny at Fala. The lord Maxwell was appointed to command ten thousand men; but though Maxwell was himself a counsellor and favourite of the king, they were injudiciously composed of the followers of Cassilis, Glencairn, and other westland nobles, amongst whom the Reformation had made considerable progress, and who were proportionably disgusted with the war, which they regarded as undertaken at the instigation and to serve the interest of the papal clergy. This may in part account for the extraordinary scene which followed.

Maxwell's army had assembled and advanced as far as the western border, when it was drawn up in order, and the king's favourite, Oliver Sinclair, was raised on a buckler for the purpose of reading the commission intrusting Lord Maxwell with the command of the army. The ill-timed introduction of this unpopular minion in a situation and duty so ostensible occasioned a belief that the commission which he read was in his own favour; and as this rumour gained ground a general confusion prevailed, and many who did not choose to fight under the command of so unpopular a general began to leave their ranks and return homeward.

Dacre and Musgrave, two chiefs of the English borderers who had come to watch the motions of the Scottish army, were witnesses of the strange and apparently causeless scene of confusion which it exhibited. Without knowing the cause, they took advantage of the effect and charged with a degree of courage and determination which changed the confusion of the enemy into flight, and in many cases into surrender; for a great number of the chiefs and

nobles [twelve hundred in all] chose rather to become the prisoners of the English leaders than to escape to their own country and meet the displeasure of their offended monarch. The whole Scottish force dispersed without stroke of sword, and the victors made many prisoners.

King James had advanced to the border that he might earlier receive intelligence from the army. But when he learned the news of a rout so dishonourable as that of Solway the honour of his kingdom and the reputation of his arms were, he thought, utterly and irredeemably lost, and his proud spirit refused to survive the humiliation. He removed from the border to Edinburgh, and from thence to Falkland, his deep melancholy still increasing and mixing itself with the secret springs of life. At length his powers of digestion totally failed. It was in this disconsolate condition that a messenger, who came to acquaint James V that his queen, then at Linlithgow, was delivered of a daughter, found him to whom he brought the news. "Is it so?" said the expiring monarch, reflecting on the alliance which had placed the Stuart family on the throne; "then God's will be done. It came with a lass, and will go with a lass." With these words, presaging the extinction of his house, he made a signal of adieu to his followers and courtiers and expired, December 14th, 1542.^c

There was little to distinguish the reign of James V in an intellectual sense, save for the survival of certain stars of the previous reign, such as Gawain Douglas, Boece, and Major. Sir David Lyndsay is the only exception to the creative barrenness of the period, John Bellenden's translations of Livy and Boece into the vernacular hardly deserving the name creation. But Lyndsay is a host in himself and an ornament to any period. In the history of satire there is hardly a more brilliant or vigorous wit or a more vivid portrayer of the exterior as well as the soul of his time. His *Satyre of the Three Estates* is his masterwork and has in no sense lost its charm or power by the long passage of centuries.^a

Thus was Scotland, by the death of an accomplished king, having only attained his thirty-first year, reduced once more to one of those long minorities which are the bane of her history, and which in the present case brought even more than the usual amount of misfortune. The Scots involved in a national war which had no national object were, upon the decease of James V, willingly disposed to address Henry in a pacific tone, in which they reminded him that they now spoke in behalf of their infant queen, his own near relation, who could have wronged no one since she did not as yet know good from evil.

The road to the conquest of Scotland might, to a sanguine prince, appear to lie open; but it had been repeatedly attempted from the time of Severus downwards, and had never been found practicable. The impetuous temper of Henry VIII was, therefore, forced to stoop to the plan adopted by Edward I ere the death of the Maid of Norway compelled his ambition to wear a sterner and more undisguised shape. A matrimonial alliance betwixt the young heiress of Scotland and his son, afterwards Edward VI, promised the English monarch all the advantages of conquest without either risk or odium. With this purpose he kept his eyes bent earnestly on the affairs of Scotland, to seize, as fast as they should occur, all means of furthering so desirable an object.

ARRAN REGENT: UNDER THE SWAY OF CARDINAL BEATON

The government of the kingdom was claimed by the late prime minister, Cardinal Beaton, in virtue of a testament of the deceased king, which, however, was universally regarded as a forgery perpetrated by that ambitious

[1543-1544 A.D.]

churchman.' He had, as before mentioned, succeeded his uncle, the turbulent archbishop of Glasgow, in James' councils, and was esteemed the author of most of the deceased king's unpopular measures, especially those in persecution of heresy. The nobles who had no mind to perpetuate the power under which they had long groaned unanimously rejected the claim, and preferred that of the earl of Arran, representative of the house of Hamilton, and next heir to the Scottish crown, who was recognised accordingly as regent. Beaton was made prisoner by order of the regent.

The king of England manifested the most eager and impetuous desire that the person of the infant queen should be delivered into his custody; but at last consented she should be suffered to remain in Scotland till she attained the age of ten years.

Cardinal Beaton as leader of the Roman Catholic party, and both in office and in talents head of the churchmen, was the devoted friend of France and the no less determined enemy of England. By lavishing money which his numerous church preferments furnished in great store, by awakening all the ancient prejudices against England, and by dwelling on the imprudent tenacity with which Henry had clung to the rejected articles of the treaty, he contrived to unite a large and powerful body of the nobles, comprehending Argyll, Huntly, and Bothwell, in opposition to the English alliance. A great number of the barons, chiefly from jealousy of the national independence, joined the same party; and the regent himself, after showing a vacillation of temper which in a less serious matter would have been ludicrous, threw himself at last into the arms of the cardinal, and, within eight days after he had ratified the marriage treaty, renounced the friendship of Henry and declared himself for the French interest. This change in Arran's politics was attended with a corresponding alteration in his religion, for he had hitherto pretended great respect for the doctrines of the Reformation, and now he consented to every measure proposed by the cardinal for its suppression.

Henry was not to be trifled with in this manner with impunity. Resentment at what he termed the Scottish breach of faith prompted him to a vindictive invasion by sea and land: a strong army under the earl of Hertford was embarked in a numerous fleet. He took the Scots by surprise, landed in the Firth May 4th, 1544, plundered Edinburgh and the adjacent country, and thus destroyed for a time the English influence with the Scottish nobles. A series of destructive inroads on the frontier only added to the unpopularity of Henry with the people of Scotland. Even Angus the guest, pensioner, and brother-in-law of Henry by his marriage with the widowed queen of James IV, renounced the English monarch's friendship during the course of these ravages, and was distinguished by the share he took in an action by which they were in some degree revenged.^c

The savage temper of Henry VIII no more strongly appears than in the directions which, on the 10th of April, 1544, he transmitted through a despatch of the privy council to the earl of Hertford. After observing that the grand attempt on Scotland was delayed for a season, they command him, in the mean time, to make an inroad into Scotland, "there to put all to fire and sword, to burn Edinburgh town, and to raze and deface it when you have sacked it and gotten what you can out of it, as that it may remain for ever a perpetual memory of the vengeance of God lighted upon it for their falsehood and disloyalty. Do what you can," continue they, "out of hand and without long tarrying to beat down and overthrow the castle, sack Holyrood House, and as many towns and villages about Edinburgh as ye conveniently can;

[^c Hume Brown^f says that there can be little doubt that Beaton forged this will.]

[1544-1546 A.D.]

sack Leith, and burn and subvert it, and all the rest, putting man, woman, and child to fire and sword, without exception, when any resistance shall be made against you; and this done, pass over to the Fife land, and extend like extremities and destructions in all towns and villages whereunto ye may reach conveniently, not forgetting, amongst all the rest, so to spoil and turn upside down the cardinal's town of St. Andrews, as the upper stone may be the nether, and not one stick stand by another, sparing no creature alive within the same, specially such as either in friendship or blood be allied to the cardinal." "This journey," the despatch goes on to state, "shall succeed most to his majesty's honour."^a

Never before had Scotland been so ruthlessly pillaged. In Hume Brown's words: "The ruins of the abbeys of Kelso, Melrose, Dryburgh, and Coldingham was the work of Hertford's miscellaneous host and not of the followers of John Knox, as till recent years was the accepted tradition of Scottish history."^a

THE MARTYRDOM OF WISHART AND THE MURDER OF BEATON

Cardinal Beaton had not reached the summit of affairs without making many private enemies as well as acquiring the hatred of those who considered him as the prime opponent of the Protestant church, and author of the death of those revered characters who had suffered for heresy. A recent instance of this kind perpetrated under Beaton's own eye was marked with unusual atrocity. A Protestant preacher, named George Wishart, born of a good family and respected for eloquence, learning, and for a gentleness and sweetness of disposition which made him universally esteemed, had distinguished himself much by preaching the reformed doctrines. Even the regent declined to proceed against him or to commission lay judges to sit upon his trial. The cardinal, however, having treacherously got his person into his hands, proceeded to arraign the prisoner of heresy before an ecclesiastical court, by whom he was tried, found guilty, and condemned to the stake. Beaton himself sat in state to behold the execution of the sentence from the walls of the castle of St. Andrews, before which it took place.

When Wishart came forth to die, and beheld the author of his misfortunes reposing in pomp upon the battlements to witness his torments he said to those around, either from a conviction that the country would not long abide the cardinal's violence, or from that spirit of prescience said sometimes to inspire the words of those who are standing betwixt time and eternity, "See yonder proud man: I tell you that in a brief space ye shall see him flung out on yonder rampart with infamy and scorn equal to the pomp and dignity with which he now occupies it." The martyr died with the utmost patience and bravery, and it is probable his words did not fall to the ground.

Meantime the cardinal, conscious of the danger in which he stood in a country where men's swords did not wait the sanction of legal sentence to exact vengeance for real or supposed injuries, usually dwelt in the castle of St. Andrews, which stood on a peninsula overhanging the sea and was strongly fortified. There were workmen employed to repair and strengthen the defences of the place at the very time that a desperate and irritated enemy contrived the death of the bishop within its precincts. Norman Leslie, called master of Rothes, nourished deep resentment against the cardinal for some private cause; and associating with him about fifteen men who shared his sentiments for sundry reasons, they surprised the castle at the break of day, expelled the garrison, and murdered the object of their enmity with many circumstances of cruelty.^c

[1546-1547 A.D.]

Leslie and Carmichael throwing themselves furiously upon their victim who earnestly implored mercy stabbed him repeatedly. But Melville, a milder fanatic, who professed to murder not from passion but religious duty, reproved their violence. "This judgment of God," said he, "ought to be executed with gravity, although in secret"; and presenting the point of his sword to the bleeding prelate he called on him to repent of his wicked courses, and especially of the death of the holy Wishart, to avenge whose innocent blood they were now sent by God. "Remember," said he, "that the mortal stroke I am now about to deal is not the mercenary blow of a hired assassin, but the just vengeance which hath fallen on an obstinate and cruel enemy of Christ and the Holy Gospel." On his saying this, he repeatedly passed his sword through the body of his unresisting victim, who sunk down from the chair to which he had retreated and instantly expired.

The alarm had now risen in the town; the common bell was rung, and the citizens, with their provost, running in confused crowds to the side of the fosse, demanded admittance, crying out that they must instantly speak with my lord cardinal. They were answered from the battlements, that it would be better for them to disperse, as he whom they called for could not come to them, and would not trouble the world any longer. This, however, only irritated them the more, and being urgent that they would speak with him, Norman Leslie reproved them as unreasonable fools who desired an audience of a dead man; and dragging the body to the spot, hung it by a sheet over the wall, naked, ghastly, and bleeding from its recent wounds. "There," said he, "there is your God; and now that ye are satisfied get you home to your houses," a command which the people instantly obeyed.

Thus perished Cardinal David Beaton, the most powerful opponent of the reformed religion in Scotland, by an act which some authors, even in the present day, have scrupled to call murder. To these writers the secret and long-continued correspondence of the conspirators with England was unknown; a circumstance perhaps to be regretted, as it would have spared some idle and angry reasoning.

By its disclosure we have been enabled to trace the secret history of these iniquitous times, and it may now be pronounced without fear of contradiction that the assassination of Beaton was no sudden event, arising simply out of indignation for the fate of Wishart; but an act of long-projected murder, encouraged, if not originated, by the English monarch, and, so far as the principal conspirators were concerned, committed from private and mercenary considerations.^c

The murderers of Beaton now shut themselves up in the castle of St. Andrews to undergo siege. Here they were joined by many who were in danger of being accused of complicity. Among these strangely was John Knox. For fourteen months the castle withstood siege. The murderers had been declared traitors, and the idea of an English alliance rejected by the estates meeting at Edinburgh June 10th, 1546. Henry VIII died in January, and Francis I March 31st, 1547.

The new French king, Henry II, brother of Mary of Lorraine, sent a French fleet to reduce the castle still held by its garrison of one hundred and fifty. After bombardment the garrison accepted terms, July 21st, by which they were to be exiled, but otherwise set free. But on surrendering they were taken to France, and the gentlemen immured in prison, while their humbler fellows were sent to the galleys. Among these latter was John Knox, whom France chained to an oar, and who later was her bitterest enemy in Scotland.^a

THE DISASTER AT PINKIE AND THE MARRIAGE ALLIANCE WITH FRANCE
(1547 A.D.)

Even the death of Beaton, though his most inveterate political adversary, did not benefit the cause of Henry. The cardinal's place, both as primate and as counsellor of the regent, was supplied by a natural brother of the earl of Arran, John Hamilton, abbot of Paisley, who, from possessing a superior firmness of mind, exercised much influence over his brother, and was as devoted a friend to France and the Catholic cause as the murdered cardinal had been during his lifetime.

So stood the English interests in Scotland, which had been ruined by the impetuous rudeness of Henry VIII. But in emulative prosecution of the war betwixt England and Scotland, the duke of Somerset, protector of England, entered the eastern marches at the head of an army. Prudence and delay would probably have placed the victory in the hands of the Scots. But the military testament of Robert Bruce was once more forgotten, and the Scots with national impetuosity abandoned the vantage ground to fight for the victory which time and patience would have given them without risk.

The battle of Pinkie on September 10th, 1547, as described in our history of England, ended without either a long or bloody conflict. The English horsemen pursued the chase almost to the gates of Edinburgh with unusual severity, and many of the fugitives were drowned in the Esk which was swelled with the tide. The whole space between the field of battle and the capital was strewn with dead bodies and with the weapons which the fugitives had thrown away in their flight.

Yet this great battle was followed by no corresponding effects; for the duke of Somerset having garrisoned and fortified the town of Haddington and received the compulsory submission of some of the border chiefs, withdrew to England with his victorious army. On the other hand, the loss of the battle, as it threw the Scottish nation into despair, compelled them in a manner to seek the assistance of France.¹ An assembly of nobles met at Stirling when it was agreed that the efficient support of their ancient ally should be purchased by offering the hand of their young queen in marriage to the dauphin of France. They consented voluntarily to place her person in the hands of Henry II, the father of her bridegroom, on condition that he would furnish the Scottish nation with immediate and powerful assistance to recover Haddington and such other places as the English had garrisoned, and to defend the rest of the kingdom in case of a repetition of the invasions. The liberal terms thus freely offered to France were the more surprising as the estates of Scotland had recently shown insurmountable reluctance to place similar confidence in Henry VIII. But from the prejudices created by a thousand years of war the Scottish and the English nations were inspired with a jealousy of each other which did not exist in either country against other foreigners.

Henry II of France caught at so favourable an opportunity of acquiring a new kingdom for his son. Six thousand veteran troops, under Montalambert, the sieur d'Essé, were instantly despatched to Scotland, and it was in the camp which they formed before Haddington that the articles of the royal marriage were finally adjusted. The queen-regent used the utmost of her art and address, and no woman of her time possessed more, in order to gain

[¹ The French gained more by the defeat of their allies than the English by their victory. —Wm. Robertson.^A]

[1548-1554 A.D.]

over the opinions of such as could be influenced, and intimidate those who could not be so won. The regent, earl of Arran, was induced to consent by a grant from Henry II to accept the French title of duke of Chatellerault, with a considerable pension from the same country. The opposition of meaner persons was silenced by very intelligible threats of violence from men that were extremely likely to keep their word; the fear of the French arms, amongst which they held their councils, imposed silence on others; and the person of the infant queen Mary, suitably attended, was sent over to France by the same fleet which had escorted d'Essé and his troops to Scotland.¹ And thus, ere Mary knew what the word meant, she was bestowed in marriage upon a sickly and silly boy, a lot which might be said to begin her calamities.

MARY OF LORRAINE BECOMES REGENT (1454 A.D.)

The queen-dowager having perfected this great match in favour of the king of France, her kinsman, became naturally desirous of obtaining the interim administration of Scotland until her daughter should attain the years of discretion. For this purpose she dealt with the indolent and indecisive earl of Arran for a cession of the regency. An augmented pension from France, high honours to himself and his friends, were liberally promised, together with a public acknowledgment of his right as next heir to the Scottish throne. He finally made the sacrifice required of him, and aware perhaps of his own unpopularity, resigned to the superior firmness of Mary of Guise [or, as she is more often called, Mary of Lorraine] the regency of Scotland April 12th, 1554.

Meanwhile the queen-mother showed vigour and determination. With the assistance of d'Essé's French troops she retook Haddington from the English, October 14th, 1549, and drove out other petty garrisons which they had established after the battle of Pinkie. This warfare, though the actions were on a small scale, was uncommonly sanguinary. Many of the English officers had committed insolencies and atrocities during their hour of success which the Scots could not forgive; and not only did the latter themselves refuse quarter to the English, but there were instances of their purchasing English prisoners from the French, merely, like Indian savages, to have the pleasure of putting them to death. After so much expenditure of blood and treasure the Scots were included in the Treaty of Boulogne, March 24th, 1550, betwixt France and England, which amid civil discord and party faction the earl of Warwick, now at the head of the English affairs, was glad to accede to.

The queen-regent of Scotland in her new acquisition of power had one great disadvantage. She was a French woman; and while she was in truth desirous of serving her country and sovereign she found it very difficult to convince the people of Scotland that she was not willing to sacrifice the interests of the country which she ruled to that of which she was the native. The auxiliary army of d'Essé did not leave Scotland without a renewal of the hostile disposition which had on former occasions arisen between the French troops and the Scots, to whose assistance they had been sent. The Scots and French fought in the streets of Edinburgh, in which skirmish the lord

¹ Knox, the stern apostle of Protestantism, says, that "some were corrupted with buds (bribes), some deceived with flattering promises, and some for fear were compelled to consent, for the French souldiers were officers of arms in that parliament. The lord of Buccleuch, a bloody man, with many G—d's wounds, said that they that did not assent should do worse." [When Mary arrived in France, Henry II exclaimed: "France and Scotland are one nation now."]

[1537-1558 A. D.]

provost of the town and the governor of the castle were both slain. Peace was restored with the utmost difficulty; but their having been guilty of such an insult in the capital of their ally added greatly to the growing unpopularity of the auxiliaries.

Mary of Lorraine, out of a natural affection to her nation, hoped to serve the interests of France now engaged in war with Spain and England, by embroiling Scotland in the quarrel. But although she contrived without much trouble to effect a breach of the peace between two countries which were equally jealous and irritable, yet the Scottish nation, taught by experience, entered into the contest as a defensive war only; neither could the urgency of Le Crocq, who commanded the French troops, nor the entreaties of the queen-regent prevail on them to set a foot on English ground.

Meanwhile the marriage of the young queen of Scots to the dauphin was solemnly celebrated, April 24th, 1558, and that union between France and Scotland achieved so far as depended upon the execution of the marriage treaty. But by this time the subject of religion had become so interesting as to have greater weight in the scale of national policy than at any former period.^c

THE EARLY CAREER OF JOHN KNOX

The removal of Beaton, the representative of the old cause, was immediately followed by the entrance of John Knox, the representative of the new; for among the refugees who fled to the castle of St. Andrews to escape the vengeance of the prelacy the future reformer was one. As the biography of this remarkable man constitutes so large a portion of the history of the Scottish Reformation, a brief notice of him in this place may not be unnecessary.



JOHN KNOX
(1506-1572)

John Knox was born [at Haddington, the county town of East Lothian] in the year 1505. He was of humble parentage, his ancestors having been retainers of the house of Hailes; and as such they rendered feudal military service to the first earls of Bothwell. Being destined for the church, John, at the age of sixteen, was sent to the university of Glasgow, where after the usual course of study he regented; he also appears to have studied at the university of St. Andrews. Before he had reached the canonical age of twenty five he was admitted into priest's

orders; but an anxious spirit of doubt and inquiry prevented him from entering into the public duties of his office, and these investigations continued till his thirty-eighth year when, from serious deliberate conviction, he became a Protestant. A choice so considerably made was but the starting-point of action, upon which he entered with all his characteristic ardour; and as the companion of Wishart he exposed himself to all the dangers with which that martyr's career was continually surrounded.

Being now obnoxious to the clergy, both as an apostate priest and a

[1559 A.D.]

Protestant, he took refuge in the castle of St. Andrews, after the murder of Beaton, and during the siege that followed he was unanimously invited by the garrison to become their minister. He trembled and wept at the responsibility of those sacred duties which he was now to discharge for the first time, and only submitted after much importunity. In this way he commenced his great mission as a national religious reformer, and the commencement was characterised by the same heroic qualities that pervaded his whole life to the close. An unbending reprover of guilt wherever it might be found, he denounced the excesses of the garrison, when such a proceeding exposed him not only to hatred but personal danger.

He entered into no compromise with apparently trivial observances of the church of Rome; but condemned them all as inlets of error and incentives to idolatry. The contrast of such preaching to that of his predecessors arrested the people even in his first sermon, and they justly observed, "Others hewed at the branches of papistry, but he strikes at the root to destroy the whole."

On the surrender of the castle of St. Andrews, John Knox bore a full share of those hardships with which the unfortunate garrison was visited; for in express violation of the treaty of surrender he was, as we have seen, sent to the French galleys, where he laboured as a chained felon for nineteen months. His captivity might indeed have been perpetual, but for the kind interposition of Edward VI, through which he was set at liberty. After this Knox went to England where his services were so highly appreciated as one of Cranmer's itinerant preachers that he was appointed one of the royal chaplains, and tempted to settle in England by the offer of the bishopric of Rochester. But not deeming the Church of England as yet sufficiently reformed he rejected the application, and continued to labour as a humble missionary until the accession of Mary; and the persecution which followed obliged him, in 1554, to escape to France.

In the following year he ventured to return to Scotland; but his preaching occasioned such a stir in Edinburgh that he was cited to appear before a clerical tribunal to be tried as an heretic. He attended the summons; but justly apprehensive of consequences, and warned by former acts of treachery, the friends of Knox accompanied him in such numbers that his terrified judges failed to appear, and he continued undisturbed a little longer, when he was once more obliged to leave the country.¹ Upon his departure the clergy renewed their citation; and after a mock trial condemned him to the flames, and solemnly burned him in effigy at the cross of Edinburgh. But Knox himself was safe in Geneva, abiding his time, which arrived in May, 1559, when the religious contest was about to be decided by other weapons than those of reasoning and ridicule.

The Scottish nobles who afterwards were known as the "lords of the Congregation," were well aware of the strength which Knox would impart to their cause from his well-tryed energy, talents, and popular reputation, and accordingly they invited him to return and co-operate with them, pledging themselves to hazard their lives and fortunes in the establishment of the reformation in Scotland. He complied with the call; and thus, at the advanced age of fifty-four, and with a constitution naturally weak and impaired by many hardships, John Knox may be properly said to have commenced that task for which his whole life had been a period of training. Perhaps there

¹ Judging with all charity, it must be admitted that while his writings had all the impassioned zeal, his conduct betrayed some want of the ardent courage, of the martyr.—TYTLER.

[1558 A.D.]

is no record in history of any individual who began a great national work so late in life and yet accomplished so much. The mere return of Knox to Scotland was the trumpet-signal for the commencement of action.'

THE REGENT AND THE REFORMERS

Since the death of Cardinal Beaton there had been no attempt to turn the force of the existing laws against the growth of heresy. Hamilton the archbishop of Saint Andrews, though said to lead a life too irregular for a churchman, was more gentle and moderate than his predecessor, Beaton; and the queen-mother was too prudent and too well acquainted with the state of Scotland and the temper of the people to engage of her own accord in a struggle with so powerful a sect as the reformers, who now assumed the name of the Congregation. But when her daughter became queen of France the celebrated duke of Guise and the cardinal of Lorraine urged upon their sister the regent the absolute duty and necessity of rooting out the Scottish heresy. For this they had more reasons than mere zeal for the Catholic religion, though theirs was of the warmest temperature.

Mary of England died November 17th, 1558; and the land had again adopted the Protestant faith under her sister Elizabeth. The Catholics were not disposed to consider this great princess as a legitimate sovereign, but rather as the adulterous daughter of Henry VIII by Anne Boleyn his concubine, for whose sake he had broken the bonds of matrimony with Queen Catherine, and cast away the filial obedience due to the see of Rome. Failing Elizabeth, Mary queen of Scotland was heir of England in right of her grandmother Margaret, the sister of Henry VIII. In the eyes of all true Catholics, she had not only a contingent but an immediate claim to succeed her namesake in the government. This title offered the most splendid visions to the two brothers of the house of Guise, who aimed at nothing less than subjecting England itself to the sway of their niece by means of the English Catholics, a numerous and powerful body.

But this could only be accomplished by gaining for the Scottish queen the credit of a faithful nursing-mother of the church, in destroying that branch of the great northern heresy which had raised its head in the kingdom of Scotland. She could not with consistency claim the character of a sound Catholic, a person likely to re-establish Catholicism in England while the exercise of the reformed religion was publicly permitted in the realm which was properly her own.

Mary's mother the queen-regent was therefore against her better judgment urged to pick a quarrel with the reformers in Scotland, and she involved herself by the attempt in a train of consequences which poisoned all the future tranquillity of her regency and her life. The pretext was taken from some insults offered by the Protestants to the images of the Catholic faith, and particularly to Saint Giles, patron of the metropolis, whose effigy was first thrown into the North Loch, and then burned.

To chastise this insolence various among the most noted popular preachers were summoned to appear before the queen-regent and the bishops and to undergo their trial as authors of the sedition. The preachers resolved to attend; and that they might do so with safety they availed themselves of a custom in Scotland (a right barbarous one) by which a person accused was wont to appear at the bar with as many friends as were willing to stand by him and defend his cause. The time was propitious; for a band of western gentlemen, zealous Protestants, were returning homeward from military services on the

[1557-1558 A.D.]

border and willingly appeared in arms for the protection of their pastors. They were in vain charged by proclamation to depart from the city. On the contrary they assembled themselves and with little reverence forced themselves into the queen's presence, then sitting in council with the bishops.

Chalmers of Gadgirth, a bold and zealous man, spoke in the name of the rest: "Madam, we know that this proclamation is a device of the bishops and of that bastard (the primate of Saint Andrews) that stands beside you. We avow to God that ere we yield we will make a day of it. These idle drones oppress us and our tenants, and now they seek the lives of our ministers, and our own. Shall we suffer this any longer? No, madam, it shall not be." As he concluded, every man put on his steel bonnet. The queen-regent was compelled to have recourse to fair words and entreaties, for little less was to be apprehended than the present massacre of the Roman Catholic churchmen. But by the queen's discharging the proclamation, an ensuing gentle and kind words to Gadgirth and his companions, the danger was averted for the present.

The Scottish Protestants saw their advantage, and were encouraged to further boldness. They made a popular tumult by attacking a procession of churchmen which paraded through the streets of the city. The images, which the insurgents termed Dagon and Bel, were dashed to pieces in contempt and derision: as for the churchmen, we may take John Knox's word,^e "that there was a sudden affray amongst them; for down goeth the crosses, off goeth the surplices, round caps, and cornets with the crowns; the grayfriars gaped, the blackfriars blew, the priests panted and fled, and happy was he who first got to the house, for such a sudden fray came never among the generation of antichrist within the realm before."

This was the wild proceeding of a rabble; but an association and bond entered into by the principal persons of the Congregation, bound them to defend their ministers, and assert the rights of hearing and preaching the Gospel.^e

THE FIRST COVENANT: THE LORDS OF THE CONGREGATION (1557 A.D.)

On the 3rd of December, 1557, that memorable bond or covenant was drawn up which henceforth united the Protestants under one great association which was subscribed immediately by their principal supporters, and could not be deserted without something like apostasy. It described in no mild or measured terms the bishops and ministers of the Romish church as members of Satan, who sought to destroy the gospel of Christ and his followers, and declared that they felt it to be their duty to strive in their Master's cause even unto death—certain as they were of victory in him. For this purpose it declared that they had entered into a solemn promise in the presence of God and his Congregation, to set forward and establish with their whole power and substance his blessed Word—to labour to have faithful ministers—to defend them at the peril of their lives and goods against all tyranny; and it concluded by anathematising their adversaries, and denouncing vengeance against all the superstition, idolatry, and abominations of the papal church.

This bond, which was drawn up at Edinburgh, received the signatures of the earls of Glencairn, Argyll, Morton, Lord Lorne, Erskine of Dun, and many others. It was evidently an open declaration of war against the established religion; toleration and compromise were at an end, and their next step showed that the Congregation—for so the reformers now named themselves—were determined to commence their proceedings in earnest. They

[1557-1558 A.D.]

passed a resolution declaring "that in all parishes of the realm the common prayer (by which was meant the service book of Edward VI) should be read weekly, on Sunday and other festival days, in the parish churches, with the lessons of the Old and New Testament, conformed to the book of common prayer; and that if the curates of parishes be qualified they shall be caused to read the same;" but if they refuse, then the most qualified in the parish were directed to supply their place. It was resolved at the same time that "doctrine, preaching, and interpretation of the Scripture be used privately in quiet houses, avoiding great conventions of the people thereto, until such time as God should move the prince to grant public preaching by true and faithful ministers."

These resolutions the lords of the Congregation proceeded to put into execution in such places as were under their power. The earl of Argyll encouraged Douglas, his chaplain, to preach openly in his house; other barons imitated his example; an invitation was addressed to Knox (November, 1558), requesting his immediate presence amongst them, and a deep alarm seized the whole body of the Roman clergy.

They represented, not unreasonably, the declarations of the Congregation and their subsequent conduct as acts bordering upon treason; the Roman faith, they said, was still the established religion of the state, it enjoyed the sanction of the law, and the protection of the sovereign, and it was now openly attacked, and attempted to be subverted by a private association of men who, although no ways recognised by the constitution, had assumed the power of legislation. To what this might grow it was difficult to say, but it was impossible to view so bold a denunciation of the national religion without apprehension and dismay.

These remonstrances were addressed to the queen-regent at that critical season when the marriage between her daughter and the dauphin, although proposed in the Scottish parliament, had not been fully agreed to. It was necessary for her to manage matters warily with the principal nobles, and she expressed a steadfast disinclination to all extreme measures against the Congregation. The archbishop of St. Andrews also, a prelate whose character partook nothing of cruelty, though his morals were loose and depraved, addressed an admonitory letter to Argyll, persuading him to dismiss his heretical chaplain, promising to supply his place with a learned and Catholic instructor, complaining of the reproaches to which his ecclesiastical lenity had exposed him, and insinuating that repeated provocations might compel him, as the spiritual guardian of the church, to adopt a severer course (March, 1558). Nor was it long before this severity was experienced, although there seems good ground for believing that the prelate was innocent of having instigated it.^a

MARTYRDOM OF MYLN: THE PARTIES IN ARMS

The first to suffer was a priest over eighty years old, Walter Myln (or Mill), who had adopted the doctrines of the reformers and been condemned as a heretic in Beaton's day. He had however escaped, and now felt encouraged to resume his preaching. He was seized and condemned at St. Andrews. The clergy found him guilty, but there was difficulty in securing a secular judge to sentence him. This was at last secured, and he was burned April 28th, 1558. He perished with great courage.^a

"As for myself," said he, "I am fourscore and two years old and cannot live long by the course of nature, but a hundred better shall rise out of the

[1558-1559 A.D.]

ashes of my bones, and I trust in God I am the last that shall suffer death in Scotland for this cause." And his prophetic wishes were fulfilled: he was the last in that country of the army of martyrs [until the martyrs to Episcopacy in the reign of James II].

This cruel and iniquitous execution was viewed by the people with horror and excited the utmost indignation in the leaders of the Congregation. They remonstrated in firm terms to the queen-regent, and when this princess assured them that she was no party to such sanguinary proceedings their whole animosity was directed against the clergy. Emissaries commissioned by the reformers travelled through the country, exposing the superstition, wickedness, and injustice of such conduct; many of the lesser barons and the greater part of the towns joined the party; a majority of the people declared themselves ready to support the cause, and the Protestant lords presented an address to the dowager, in which they claimed redress at her hands "of the unjust tyranny used against them by those called the estate ecclesiastical."⁶

Mary of Lorraine's government continued to be still further embarrassed by the zeal with which her brothers of Lorraine continued to press in the most urgent manner the adoption of violent measures against the Protestants. In compliance with instructions from France the queen, forgetful of the violent scene with Chalmers of Gadgirth, again summoned the Protestant preachers to appear before a court of justice to be held at Stirling on the 10th of May, 1559. Again the zeal of the Congregation convoked a species of insurrectionary army to protect their ministers, which assembled at Perth, then animated by the preachings of John Knox. The queen-regent foresaw the danger which impended, and a second time appeared to retreat from her purpose, and engaged to put a stop to the prosecution of the ministers.

Through the whole eventful scene the subtlety of the queen-dowager made it manifest that she adopted and acted upon the fatal maxim that no faith was to be kept with heretics. The Protestants had no sooner dispersed their levies than the queen caused the actions against their preachers to be anew insisted on; and upon the non-appearance of the parties cited, sentence of outlawry was pronounced against them.

The Protestants were incensed by this duplicity of the queen; and after a vehement discourse by John Knox against the idolatry of the popish worship, and a casual brawl which followed betwixt an impudent priest and a petulant boy, the minds of the auditors were so much inflamed that they destroyed, first the church in which the sermon had been preached, and then the other churches and monasteries of Perth, breaking to fragments the ornaments and images, and pillaging the supplies of provisions which the monks had provided in great quantity.

The queen in the mean time had drawn together her French soldiery, and still more deeply irritated by the late proceedings of the multitude prepared to march upon Stirling, and from thence to Perth, before the lords of the Congregation could assemble their vassals. But she had to deal with prudent and active men, who were not willing a second time to be cheated into terms which might be kept or broken at the regent's pleasure. They assembled their forces so speedily that they could with confidence face Mary of Lorraine and her army, though above seven thousand strong. Still, the principal Protestant nobles thought it best to come to an agreement with the queen-regent rather than hurry the nation into a civil war. They agreed to admit Mary of Lorraine into Perth on condition that her French troops should not approach within three miles of the city; that no one should be prosecuted on account of the recent disturbances, and that all matters in debate between

the government and the lords of the Congregation should be left to the consideration of parliament. No sooner, however, had this treaty been adjusted than the queen broke its conditions by displacing the magistrates of Perth and garrisoning the town with six hundred men. She endeavoured to palliate this breach of faith by alleging that these troops did not consist of native Frenchmen, but of Scotsmen under French pay. Far from receiving this evasion as a good argument the earl of Argyll and Lord James Stuart retired to St. Andrews (June 3rd), and were there met by the earl of Menteith, the laird of Tullibardine, and other professors of their religion.

Although in an archiepiscopal see, and threatened by the primate that if he ventured to ascend his pulpit he should be saluted with a shower of musket-balls, John Knox boldly preached before the Congregation and animated their resolution of defending their freedom of conscience. As it appeared plain that the violation of the treaty of Perth would once more put the lords of the Congregation in arms, the queen on her part endeavoured to seize an advantage by superior alacrity. She was again disappointed, although she early put her troops, now amounting to about three thousand men in the pay of France, into motion against St. Andrews, whither the principal reformers had retreated.

The lords of the Congregation boldly determined to meet the queen-mother in the field; and though they set out from St. Andrews with only one hundred horse, yet ere they had marched ten miles they were joined by such numbers as enabled them to remonstrate with the queen rather than to petition for indemnity. Mary of Lorraine again resorted to the duplicity with which she was but too familiar. She obtained a pacification, but it was only on the condition that she should transport her French soldiery to the southern side of the firth; and she agreed to send commissioners to St. Andrews to settle on conditions of peace. The Frenchmen were accordingly withdrawn for the time; but, with her usual insincerity, the queen altogether neglected to send the commissioners, or take any steps for the establishment of a solid composition.

The consequences were that the Congregation resumed arms a third time and forcibly occupied Perth, June 24th. From thence they advanced in triumph to the capital, the people, particularly the citizens of the burghs which they occupied, eagerly seconding them in the work of reformation; especially in the destruction of monasteries and the defacing the churches by destroying what they considered the peculiar objects of Roman Catholic worship. The queen-mother gave way to the torrent and retreated to Dunbar June 29th, to await till want of money and of provisions should oblige the lords of the Congregation to disperse their forces.

This period was not long in arriving. The troops of these barons consisted entirely of their vassals, serving at their own expense. When the provisions they brought with them to the camp (which never at the utmost exceeded food for the space of forty days) were expended, they had no means of keeping the field, and considered the campaign as ended. The burghers had their callings to pursue, and however zealous for religion, were under the necessity of returning to their own residences when days and weeks began to elapse. These causes so soon diminished the army of the Congregation that the queen-regent advancing with her compact body of mercenary troops might have taken Edinburgh by storm, had it not been for a third treaty, patched up indeed and acceptable to neither party, but which each was willing to receive for a time rather than precipitate the final struggle.

The articles of convention were that the lords of the Congregation should

[1559 A.D.]

evacuate Edinburgh to which the queen-regent should return, but that she should not introduce a French garrison there. The Protestants agreed to abstain from future violation of religious houses; while the queen mother consented to authorise the free exercise of the Protestant religion all over the kingdom, and to allow that in Edinburgh no other should be openly professed. These terms were reluctantly assented to on both sides. The Protestants were desirous that the French troops, the principal support of the queen-regent's power, should be removed out of the kingdom; while Mary of Lorraine on the other hand was secretly determined to augment their number and place them in a commanding position.

She was the rather determined on following the violent policy suggested by the brothers of Guise, because the death of Henry II, July 10th, and the accession of Francis and Mary to the throne had rendered the queen's uncles all-powerful at the court of France.

A thousand additional soldiers having arrived from France in July, the queen-regent, in conformity with the policy which she had adopted, employed them in fortifying as a place of arms the sea-port of Leith. The lords of the Congregation remonstrated against this measure; but their interference was not attended to. On the contrary the queen-regent, influenced by the dangerous counsel of her brothers the princes of Lorraine, shut herself up in the newly-fortified town and haughtily disputed the right of the nobility to challenge her prerogative to establish her residence where she would, and to secure it by military defences when she thought proper.

THE LORDS OF THE CONGREGATION DEPOSE THE REGENT AND RECEIVE MONEY
FROM ELIZABETH

The civil rights of the Scottish nation as well as their religious liberties were now involved in the debate; and the lords of the Congregation were joined by the duke of Chatellerauld, and other noblemen who continued Catholics. Both parties, having convoked an assembly as numerous and powerful as a Scottish parliament, united in the decisive step of passing an act in October, by which, under deep professions of duty to the king and queen, they solemnly deprived the queen-regent of her office as having been exercised inconsistently with the liberties and contrary to the laws of the kingdom.

Among the nobles who thus lifted the banner of defiance against the highest established authority of the kingdom, the chief was Lord James Stuart [later famous as the earl of Moray] called at this time the prior of St. Andrews, a natural son of King James V, and a half-brother, consequently, of Mary Stuart. If it had so chanced that this eminent person had possessed a legitimate title to the crown of Scotland, it would probably have been worn by him with much splendour. As it was, he was thrown into circumstances in which, as we shall see, high ambition encouraged by tempting opportunity proved too strong for the ties of gratitude and family affection, and ultimately brought a man of great talents and many virtues to an early and a bloody grave.

His strong mind had early received with conviction the reformed doctrines, and he was distinguished among the Protestant lords by his zeal, sagacity, and courage: so that though the earl of Arran (duke of Chatellerauld, and formerly regent) had again returned to the side of the lords of the Congregation, and was complimented with the title of chief of their league, yet the general confidence of the party was reposed in the wisdom, courage, and integrity of the

prior of St. Andrews. Argyll, Glencairn, and others, the associates of this distinguished person, were, like himself, men of courage and sagacity and full of that species of enthusiasm which is inspired by an enlarged sphere of thought and action, and by the sense of having thrown off the fetters of ecclesiastical bondage.

The lords of the Congregation were not long in discovering, that in the task of besieging a fortified town like Leith, defended by veteran and disciplined troops, they had greatly over-rated their own strength. A still greater difficulty arose from the want of money to pay and maintain an army in the field. The lords of the Congregation resolved upon invoking the assistance of England, the only neighbour of power and wealth whose alliance or countenance could counterpoise that of France.

The cause of the Reformation had been espoused and defended by Queen Elizabeth, whose right to the crown and whose title to legitimacy depended upon her father Henry's having disowned the authority of the church of Rome. Indeed, if she herself had not seen her danger from the queen of Scots' title being set up in preference to her own, the princes of Lorraine had, with arrogance peculiar to their house, called her attention to the subject by making open pretence to the throne of England in behalf of their niece Mary of Scotland.

Money had been struck in France bearing the arms of England; proclamations had been made in the names of Francis and Mary as king and queen of that country, as well as of France and Scotland; and an open and avowed claim to the crown of England was brought forward in Queen Mary's behalf by every mode short of a direct challenge of Elizabeth's title. The English Catholics were known to be favourable to these views. It was natural, therefore, that Elizabeth, whose birth and title of succession were thus openly impugned by the princes of Lorraine, should foster and encourage those Scottish insurgents who were in arms to dispossess their sister the queen-regent of the government of Scotland. Accordingly, though accustomed to act with great economy, she was readily induced to advance considerable sums to the lords of the Congregation, by which assistance they were enabled to form the siege of Leith.

Their undertaking was at first very unfortunate. A large sum of the subsidy [£1,000] furnished by Queen Elizabeth fell into the hands of the earl of Bothwell, whose ill-omened name now first appears in history, and who had adopted the faction of the queen-mother. Two skirmishes, in which the Protestants were defeated, filled the besiegers with consternation: they renounced their enterprise precipitately and retreated from Edinburgh, November 25th, to Stirling with fallen hopes and an army diminished by desertion. But Knox encouraged them by his fulminations from the pulpit: he sternly upbraided the hearers with their confidence in the arm of flesh, and promised them victory as soon as they should humble themselves to acknowledge the power of the Divine Disposer of events. The eloquence of this extraordinary and undaunted preacher was calculated to work on the stubborn and rough men to whom it was addressed.

The lords of the Congregation resumed their purpose of resistance to the last, and resolved to despatch William Maitland of Lethington, one of the most distinguished statesmen of his time, to show the queen of England the pressure of the circumstances under which they laboured. The great reputation which Lethington enjoyed as a statesman did not exceed his real abilities; and his judicious remonstrances easily persuaded the sagacious Elizabeth to grant the succours required by his constituents.

[1550-1560 A.D.]

ENGLISH AND SCOTCH TROOPS FIGHT SIDE BY SIDE

In the mean time the queen-regent of Scotland, who had received some additional assistance from France and was in expectation of a much larger force, resolved to press the moment of advantage before the power of England could be put in motion. A body of French infantry and a considerable party of horse, amounting altogether to about four thousand men, were sent into Fife, the most civilised part of Scotland, and where the inhabitants were most devoted to the Protestant faith, to punish the rebellious and to destroy the power of the barons of that district. The invaders passed by the bridge of Stirling, and then marched eastward along the firth of Forth, burning and wasting the villages and gentlemen's houses with which the shores are thickly studded. This was not done without much resistance and retaliation.¹

The two armies continued for several days to move along the coast; the flames of towns and villages marking the progress of the French, and the sudden and vigorous charges of the Protestants interrupting from time to time the work of devastation, when the sight of a gallant navy of ships of war sailing up the firth of Forth attracted the attention of both parties, January 23rd, 1560. D'Oysel, the French general, concluded that they were the fleet expected from France, and in that belief made his soldiers fire a general salute. But he was soon painfully undeceived by the capture of two of his own transports which sailed along the shore to supply his men with provisions, and presently after this act of decisive violence the fleet showed English colours.

D'Oysel attempted a retreat to Stirling by a dangerous march in the opposite direction. The Scots had broken down a bridge over the Devon hoping to intercept the enemy's return; but the French, well acquainted with the duties of the engineer, threw over a temporary bridge composed of the roof or timbers of a church, which afforded them the means of passage. They effected with difficulty their retreat to Stirling and from thence to Lothian. The critical arrival of the English fleet being considered as an especial interference of Providence in the Protestant cause, gave new courage to the lords of the Congregation, who assembled forces on every side.

The English land army, amounting to six thousand men under Lord Grey de Wilton, now entered Scotland agreeably to the engagement of Elizabeth, and united their forces with those of the Protestants. The French troops retired into Leith, March the 29th, and prepared to make good their defence in hopes of receiving succour from France. The town was instantly blockaded by the English fleet on the side of the sea, and beleaguered on the landward side by the united armies of Scotland and England.

The eyes of all Britain were bent on this siege of Leith which the English and Scottish, now for the first time united in a common cause, carried on with the utmost perseverance, whilst the French defended themselves with such skill and determination as was worthy the character they bore of being the best troops in Europe. They were, indeed, defeated at the Hawkhill, near Loch End, where the Scottish cavalry charged them with great fury and gained considerable advantage; but the garrison of Leith shortly after avenged themselves by a successful sally, April 14th, in which they killed double the number they had lost at the Hawkhill. On this occasion it became evident that the English, who had not lately been engaged in any great national war, had in some degree lost the habit of discipline. The attack on the be-

[¹ In the words of Knox, the earl of Argyll and Lord James "for twenty and one days they lay in their clothes; their boots never came off; they had skirmishing almost every day; yea, some days from morn to even."]

[1560 A.D.]

siegers found their lines carelessly watched; and the ground where they opened their trenches being unfit for the purpose, argued inexperience on the part of the engineers.

The loss which they had sustained taught the English greater vigilance and caution; but so intimately were the French acquainted with defensive war that the siege advanced very slowly. At length a breach was effected, and an assault both terrible and persevering was made on the town May 7th. The ladders, however, which were prepared for the occasion proved too short for the purpose, and the besiegers were finally repulsed with great loss [eight hundred dead and wounded]. The English were at first depressed by this repulse; but they were encouraged to continue the siege by the duke of Norfolk, commanding in the northern counties of England with the title of lieutenant. He sent a reinforcement of two thousand men, with an assurance that the besiegers should not lack men so long as there were any remaining between Tweed and Trent. The siege was renewed more closely than ever, with reliance rather on famine than force for reducing the place. But the garrison endured without murmur the extremity of privation to which they were reduced, and continued to maintain the defence of Leith with the most undaunted firmness.¹

DEATH OF MARY OF LORRAINE; PEACE DECLARED (1560 A.D.)

Whilst the affairs of Scotland were in this unpropitious condition Mary of Lorraine, whose misrule had been the cause of these civil hostilities, died in the castle of Edinburgh, June 10th, 1560. It was justly said that her talents and virtues were her own; her errors and faults the effect of her deference to the advice of others, and especially of her aspiring brothers.

Her death was speedily followed by proposals of peace from France. In managing a difficult negotiation, the princess of Lorraine employed Monlue bishop of Valence and the Sieur de Randan, men of consummate talent. The removal of the foreign troops was agreed on July 6th; for the French government now desired their presence at home as much as the Scots wished their absence. The fortified places of Leith, Dunbar, and Inchkeith were to be surrendered, and the fortifications destroyed. It was made a condition that no foreign forces should be introduced into Scotland without consent of parliament. The administration of government was vested in a council of twelve persons, of whom seven were to be named by the king and queen and the other five by parliament. An indemnity was stipulated for whatever violences had been committed by either party during the civil war. On the matter of religion it was declared that the estates should report to the king and queen their opinion on that matter; and it was agreed that the parliament should be convoked without further summons.

A treaty was at the same time made between France and England, by which Francis and Mary recognised in the fullest manner the claim of Elizabeth to the English crown, and agreed that Mary, in time to come, should neither assume the title nor bear the arms of England. By this pacification, which was called the Treaty of Edinburgh, the civil wars of Scotland were conducted to a termination highly favourable to the cause of the Protestant religion, and very different from what seemed at first probable.

[¹ Brantôme¹ says that a seal was put on the reputation of a soldier who could say that he had taken part in this gallant defence of Leith.]

1560 A.D.]

THE PARLIAMENT OF 1560

The Scottish parliament never assembled in such numbers or had affairs of such weight before them, August 3rd, 1560; but the most pressing and important business was a petition from the principal Protestants, comprising the chief lords of the Congregation, desiring and urging the parliament to adopt a formal manifesto against the errors and corruption of the church of Rome, the exorbitance of its power and wealth and its oppressive restrictions on the liberty of conscience. The parliament with little hesitation adopted the declaration, that the domination of the church of Rome was an usurpation over the liberties and consciences of Christian men; and, to make their grounds of dissent from its doctrines still more evident, they promulgated a confession of faith in which they renounced, in the most express terms, all the tenets by which the church of Rome is distinguished from other Christian churches, and disowned the whole authority of the Roman pontiffs, and the hierarchy of their church.

The entire system of ecclesiastical government, both in doctrine and practice, which had existed for so many centuries and been held inviolably sacred, was by these enactments utterly overthrown and one altogether new adopted in its stead. The worship of Rome so long that of the kingdom and of all Europe was at once denounced as idolatrous; and following one of Rome's worst tenets, secular punishments were menaced against those who continued to worship according to the manner of their fathers. The celebration of mass was punished in the first instance by banishment, in the second by a forfeiture of goods and corporal punishment, in the third by death itself.

It is remarkable that the acts of parliament authorising these great and radical changes in the religion and church government of the country passed without the slightest opposition on the part of the Roman Catholic churchmen, bishops, and mitred abbots, who had still retained seats in the Scottish parliament. They were confounded and overawed by the unanimity with which the nobility, gentry, and burgesses united in these innovations, and all might hope that the propositions approved in parliament had every chance of falling to the ground by the king and queen refusing their consent.

Neither did they in that respect calculate falsely. Sir James Sandilands, Lord St. John, being sent to announce the proceedings of this reforming parliament to Francis and Mary, was very coldly received at the court of France, and the ratification of its statutes which he sought to obtain was positively refused. The princes of Lorraine on the other hand, by their insistent carriage towards the envoy, by their general expressions of resentment, by the levy of troops, and their employing Lord Seton and other active agents in Scotland to draw together those who still favoured the Catholic cause, intimated their purpose that the war should be rekindled in Scotland in the next spring by the invasion of a French fleet and army.

But these intentions were cut short by the sudden death of Francis II, who had acted as much under the influence of his beautiful wife as she herself, their niece, had under that of the princes of Lorraine. Charles IX, the brother and successor of Francis, was entirely governed by the counsels of his mother, who, jealous of the ascendancy which Mary had acquired over her deceased husband, avenged herself now that she had the power in her hands by so many marks of slight and contempt that the younger queen-lower, overwhelmed with the reverse of fortune, retired entirely from the court and took up her residence in solitude at Rheims.

PRESBYTERIANISM ESTABLISHED

The Scottish Protestants were rejoiced at the timely change which destroyed all possibility of their plans of reformation being disturbed by the power of France, and proceeded with full assurance of success to complete the model of their church government. The tenets of the celebrated Calvin respecting ecclesiastical rule were selected, probably because they were considered most diametrically opposite to those of Rome. This form of church government had been established in the city of Geneva where John Knox and other reformed teachers pursued their theological studies, and it was earnestly recommended by them to the imitation of their countrymen. This modification of the reformed religion differed in its religious tenets but little from that of the Lutherans, and still less from that which was finally adopted in England.

But the Presbyterian system was, in its church government, widely distinguished from that of all countries which, renouncing the religious doctrines of the Roman clergy, had retained their hierarchy, whether in whole or in part. Invented in a republican country the Presbyterian government was entirely unconnected with and independent of the civil government of the state, and owned no earthly head. The church was governed in the extreme resort by the general assembly of the church, being a convocation of the clergy by representation, together with a certain number of the laity, admitted to sit and vote with them as representing the Christian community under the name of lay elders.

In the original sketch of the Scottish church discipline provision was made for certain persons named superintendents who were intrusted, as their name implies, with the spiritual power of bishops. A digest of the forms of the church called the Book of Discipline¹ was willingly received and subscribed to by the readers of the Congregation January 15th, 1561, the lay reformers offering no objection to anything which the preachers proposed, whether respecting the doctrines of the church or the forms by which it was to be governed.^c

Through its different courts every doubtful case was so thoroughly sifted that a satisfactory result was generally obtained, and an error in doctrine, however subtle, could scarcely escape undetected and unannounced. This fact was distinctly stated by King James himself to an English ecclesiastic who was expressing his wonder that so seldom heresy had troubled the good people of Scotland. "I'll tell you how, man," replied this royal solver of difficulties, with more than his wonted wisdom: "if it spring up in a parish, there is an eldership to take notice of it; if it be too strong for them, the presbytery is ready to crush it; if the heretic prove too obstinate for them, he shall find more witty heads in the synod; and if he cannot be convinced there, the general assembly, I'll warrant you, will not spare him."

As the Scottish reformers were aware that the general neglect of ecclesiastical discipline in the Romish church had been a fruitful source of its crimes and the principal cause of its downfall, their chief care was to restore the apostolic rule to its primitive importance. "As no commonwealth," they said in their preamble, "can flourish or long endure without good laws and sharp execution of the same, so neither can the kirk of God be brought to

[¹ Hume Brown^s calls this "the most interesting and in many respects the most important of public documents in the history of Scotland."]

[1561 A.D.]

purity, neither yet retained in the same, without the order of ecclesiastical discipline, which stands in reproof and correcting of the faults which the civil sword either doth neglect or may not punish."

Its impartial character and universal application were also thus stated: "To discipline must all the estates within the realm be subject, as well the rulers as they that are ruled; yea, and the preachers themselves, as well as the poorest within the kirk." It was upon these just but stringent principles that they specified the offences which lay within the cognisance of the church courts, and the penalties with which they should be visited. And truly the labour to be encountered was not a small one. The old Roman hierarchy, still struggling for the mastery, was to be suppressed; its abettors were to be watched and coerced; and the religious rites, as well as superstitious observances naturalised among the people during a course of centuries, and converted by such usage into a portion of their domestic and festive life, had to be eradicated. And even this was not the worst.

The ferocity, sensuality, and lawlessness of a community whose desperate recklessness in crime had made them the wonderment and byword of Europe, were to be superseded by the strict rule of a Christian life, and a walk and bearing consistent with those religious privileges to which they laid claim. In all this we may read a full apology for the excessive strictness with which the early Scottish church was ruled according to her First and Second Books of Discipline. We wonder at and occasionally we denounce their excessive severity; but we should previously take into account the state of society for which they legislated, and the prevalence of those offences which they condemned and punished. We should also call to mind the immense moral change which this strict ecclesiastical legislation effected in so short a period of time upon the Scottish character and habits. How different were the people of the seventeenth century in Scotland from those of the sixteenth!

This reformation, as it so greatly differed from that of other countries, had also its origin in peculiar circumstances. In Germany the sovereign princes, and in England a despotic king, threw themselves into the front of the movement and were thus enabled to impart to it that monarchical character which Protestantism has retained in these two countries. In Scotland, on the contrary, the Reformation commenced among the people and was carried onward not only independent, but often in spite of the royal authority. It was natural, therefore, that it should possess throughout an essentially democratic or republican character.

Its first champions were the inferior barons and clergy by whom the danger was braved and the battle fought; and it was only when the cause was popular and promised to be successful that the higher nobility unfurled their banners and assumed the leadership of the conflict. This was done when the only choice that remained to them was to be the leaders of such a national rising or its victims. Had they resisted or even stood still they would have been borne down and crushed beneath that resistless popular movement, which was now a stronger element of the national character than the old cherished feudalism or even the pride of national independence.

Scarcely, however, had the Scottish Reformation been impersonated in its kirk than the hostility of such selfish supporters began most distinctly to manifest itself. The Roman church being overthrown, an immense portion of the wealth of the country would revert to the common treasury and might be made available for public purposes. These, as contemplated by Knox and

his brethren, were the maintenance of the clergy, the establishment of schools and colleges, and the support of the poor.'

But such a scheme of allotment was odious to the nobility, who looked upon the wealth of the overthrown church as so much plunder which should fall to the strongest hand; and accordingly a scramble for church lands and revenues commenced among them, in which the disinterested scheme of the reformer was laughed to scorn and all but utterly defeated.

The poor, with whom Scotland more than any other country at this time abounded, were left to their shifts as before, so that until the union of the two kingdoms in 1706, Scotland continued to be a land overrun and eaten up with paupers. Such also was the fate of that splendid scheme of national education which Knox so ardently contemplated. He had already seen and announced the large intellectual character of his countrymen and the development of which it was susceptible; and anticipating from this a happy futurity for Scotland he had pleaded for the establishment of a well-endowed university in every city, and an academy in every town. But the stinted educational institutions were left just as the Reformation had found them; and those pupils who were dissatisfied with such a scanty training were still obliged to repair to the colleges of France, Holland, and Italy.

But it was in the miserable allowance for the support of the new national church that the avaricious spirit of the men in power was chiefly manifested. As the reformed ministers had at first lived upon their own private resources or upon the benevolence of their flock, and as they increased so rapidly that the six ministers which the church could muster in 1560 had grown into two hundred and fifty-two in 1567, an application was made to the privy council for the support of a regular clergy in all time coming. The arrangement made on this occasion by the council was that the ecclesiastical revenues should be divided into three parts, of which two should be given to the ejected papal clergy and the third part be divided between the court and the Protestant ministers. In this way the two-thirds given to the papal ecclesiastics, which was to last only during their lives, was finally absorbed by the nobles, who, on the death of the incumbents, appointed creatures of their own to the livings, of which they themselves drew the revenues.

As for the remaining third which was to be divided between the court and the Protestant ministers, it is easy to surmise how the latter body were likely to fare in a money contest with the former. The officers appointed by the privy council who, under the title of the "court of modification," were to divide this third into two portions, and allot to each minister a stipend according to the circumstances in which he was placed, were so anxious to gratify the queen and lords, and so careless of the interests of the clergy, that the latter received a most inadequate allowance, which was also most grudgingly and irregularly paid.

Such was the commencement of that poverty of the Scottish kirk which has continued with little modification to the present day. On this unfair partition of the ecclesiastical revenues John Knox might well exclaim, as

[¹ Maitland of Lethington asked with a sneer, whether the nobility of Scotland were now to turn hod-bearers, to toil at the building of the kirk. Knox answered with his characteristic determination that he who felt dishonoured in aiding to build the house of God would do well to look to the security of the foundations of his own. But the nobles finally voted the plan to be a "devout imagination, a well-meant but visionary system, which could not possibly be carried into execution." At a later period the parliament were in a manner ashamed into making some appointment for the clergy, payable out of the tithes which either remained in the hands of the bishops and abbots of the Scottish church, or had fallen into the hands of lay appropriators.*]

[1560-1592 A.D.]

he did: "If the end of this order, pretended to be taken for the sustentation of the ministers, be happy, my judgment fails me! I see two parts freely given to the devil, and the third part must be divided between God and the devil. To these dumb dogs the bishops, ten thousand is not enough; but to the servants of Christ, that painfully preach the gospel, one hundred marks must suffice! How can that be sustained?"

The bishops, as they had not been formally deprived by parliament, still retained their sees at the Reformation, and their successors continued to be appointed; but as such an order was incompatible with the nature of a Presbyterian church, the general assembly soon began to labour for its suppression and utter extinction. In 1574 it was therefore enacted that the jurisdiction of bishops should not exceed that of superintendents. In 1576 the assembly declared the title of bishop to be common to every one that had a particular flock over which he had an especial charge. In the year following they ordained that all bishops should in future be called by their own names instead of by those of their dioceses. In 1580 they unanimously voted Episcopacy to be unscriptural and unlawful; and in 1592 the Presbyterian form of the government of the church by general assemblies, provincial synods, presbyteries, and kirk-sessions, received the full sanction of parliament.

But every step thus won was a struggle against the court and the ruling powers. Such was especially the case when James VI ascended the Scottish throne. The arbitrary spirit of this royal pedant and polemic and his principles of king-craft naturally made him the enemy of a church so independent as that of Scotland, while his prospects of the English crown made him desirous to identify the churches of both kingdoms that he might reign over them with undisputed pre-eminence. "The bishops will govern the church and I the bishops," was the favourite sentiment he expressed, and the purpose for which he wrought in all his subsequent efforts to evert the whole system of Presbyterian polity and establish Episcopacy in its room.⁴

VANDALISM OF THE REFORMERS

The fabric of the Roman church having now been destroyed, unless in so far as its ruins afforded refuge to abbots *in commendam*, lay impropriators, and other titles given to such nobles as had enriched themselves at the expense of the establishment, the reformers were resolved to destroy those splendid monuments of ancient devotion which, in their eyes, had incurred condemnation from having been the scene of a false or idolatrous worship. The work was intrusted to the agents of the zealots among the party, who found ready assistance everywhere from a disorderly rabble to whom devastation was in itself a pleasure. The basest covetousness actuated their superiors, who frequently lent their countenance to the destructive proceedings for the sake of the paltry gain which could be derived from the sale of the sacred vessels, bells, lead, timber, and whatever of the other materials could be turned to profit. Thus, by the blind fury of the poor and the sordid avarice of the higher classes, "abbeys, cathedrals, churches, libraries, records, and even the sepulchres of the dead," says the eloquent Robertson,⁵ "perished in one common ruin."

It is said John Knox himself justified this unlimited destruction by the noted saying, "Pull down the nests and the rooks will fly off!" an expression, the politic meaning of which could only apply to the cloisters of the monks and friars. Other ill-instructed preachers gave encouragement to devastation by quoting the examples afforded in the Old Testament of the destruc-

[1561 A.D.]

tion of places in which idolatrous rites had been used: a manifest misapplication of Scripture, and one which pushed to its conclusion would have seemed to warrant an exterminating war against those who adhered to the old religion, as well as against the destruction of sacred buildings.

The ruin of the Scottish ecclesiastical buildings was, however, almost universal. The citizens of Glasgow alone set an example of rational moderation in Scotland. The mechanics of that city, under command of their deacon, took arms to resist the destruction of their venerable cathedral, at the same time offering their permission and assistance to destroy whatever could be made the object of idolatrous worship, but insisting that the edifice itself should be left uninjured.

THE RETURN OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS (1561 A.D.)

Having thus entirely new-modelled the system of church government and of national worship, the parliament of Scotland resolved to recall from France the descendant of their monarchs, whose connection with that country was broken off by the death of her husband; naturally supposing that Mary, alone and unsupported by French power, could not be suspected of meditating any interruption to the new order of religious affairs so unanimously adopted by her subjects.

With this view James Stuart, the lord prior of St. Andrews, the queen's illegitimate brother and a principal agent in all the great changes which had taken place since the commencement of the regency of Mary of Lorraine, was despatched to Paris to negotiate the return of his royal sister. The Catholics of Scotland sent an ambassador on their own part: this was Lesley, bishop of Ross, celebrated for his fidelity to Mary during her afflictions, and known as an historian of credit and eminence. He made a secret proposal on the part of the Catholics that the young queen should land in the north of Scotland and place herself under the guardianship of the earl of Huntly, who, it was boasted, would conduct her in triumph to the capital at the head of an army of twenty thousand men and restore, by force of arms, the ancient form of religion.

Mary refused to listen to advice which must have made her return to her kingdom a signal for civil war, and acquiesced in the proposals delivered by the prior of St. Andrews, on the part of the parliament. The young queen took this prudent step with the advice of her uncles of Guise, who, fallen from the towering hopes they had formerly entertained, were now chiefly desirous to place her in her native kingdom, without opposition or civil war, in which the proposals of the bishop of Ross must have immediately plunged her.

In 1561 Mary set sail for the country in which she was to assume a crown entwined with many thorns. Elizabeth had refused her a safe-conduct, and it is said that the English ships of war had orders to intercept her. The widowed queen of France took a lingering and painful farewell of the fair country over which she had so lately reigned, with expressions of the deepest sorrow. A mist hid her galleys from the English fleet, and she arrived safely at Leith on the 19th of August.

Her subjects crowded to the beach to welcome her with acclamations; but the preparations made for her reception had been too hasty to cover over the nakedness and poverty of the land. The queen, scarcely nineteen years old, wept when she saw the wretched hackneys, still more miserably accoutred, which were provided to carry her and her ladies to Holyrood, and

[1561 A.D.]

compared them in her thoughts to the fair palfreys with brilliant housings which had waited her commands in France.

The circumstance of the queen differing from the greater part of her subjects in religion was not, however, forgotten; and it seems very early to have been considered as a crime on the part of Queen Mary by the more zealous of her Protestant subjects that she did not at once and for ever relinquish the Catholic religion in which she had been bred and against which, in all probability, she had never heard a single word of argument till the first moment she touched Scottish ground. It seems to have occurred to no one that a sincere conversion could only be the result of argument and instruction, and that a hasty change of her early faith could only have indicated that the young queen was altogether indifferent on a subject so serious.

Her zealous subjects, whose hatred to popery had become a passion, tried the effect of reproaches and menaces upon the young queen, without waiting for the slower course of argument and persuasion. Pageants were presented before her, calculated to throw dishonour and reproach on the religion which she professed; and shows, made for the ostensible purpose of honouring the queen, were so conducted as to cast derision on the Catholic worship.

As Mary made her solemn entry into Edinburgh she was conducted under a triumphal arch, when a boy came out of a hole, as it were from heaven, and presented to her a Bible, a psalter, and the keys of the gates, with some verses, now lost, but which we may be sure were of a Protestant tendency. The rest of the pageant exhibited a terrible personification of the vengeance of God upon idolaters; and Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were represented as destroyed in the time of their idolatrous sacrifice. The devisers of this expressive and well-chosen emblem intended to have had a priest burned on the altar (in effigy, it is to be hoped) in the act of elevating the host; but the earl of Huntly prevented that completion of the pageant. These are the reports of Randolph, envoy of England, who was present on the occasion, and who seems to have felt that by such proceedings the Protestants were acting too precipitately and overshooting their own purpose.

These were but innuendoes of the dislike felt towards the queen's religion: the following incidents showed plainly that the more violent reformers were determined that their sovereign should not enjoy that toleration for which they themselves had not many years since been humble petitioners. The lord James when he went over to France had been warned by the preachers that to permit the importation of one mass into the kingdom of Scotland would be more fatal than an army of ten thousand men. It is probable, however, that he did not hesitate to promise that the queen should have the free exercise of her religion, and she prepared accordingly to take advantage of the stipulation.

But when on the Sunday after Mary's landing preparations were made to say mass in the royal chapel the reformers said to each other, "Shall that idol the mass again take place within this kingdom?—it shall not." The young master of Lindsay, showing in youth the fierceness of spirit which animated him in after-life, called out in the court-yard of the royal palace, that "the idolatrous priest should die the death according to God's law." The lord James with great difficulty appeased the tumult and protected the priests, whose blood would otherwise have been mingled with their sacrifice. But unwilling to avow an intention so unpopular, he was obliged to dissemble with the reformers; and while he allowed that he stood with his sword drawn at the door of the chapel, he pretended that he did not do so to protect the

[1561 A.D.]

priest, but to prevent any Scottish man from entering to witness or partake in the idolatrous ceremony.

It was immediately after this riot and the display of the insulting and offensive pageant before mentioned that the young queen had the first of her celebrated interviews with John Knox, in which he knocked at her heart so rudely as to cause her to shed tears. The stern apostle of Presbytery was, indeed, unsparing of rebuke, without sufficiently recollecting that previous conviction is necessary before reproof can work repentance, and that unless



MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS
(1542-1587)

he had possessed powers of inspiration or the gift of working miracles he could not have by mere assertion converted a Catholic from the doctrines which she had believed in from her earliest childhood. Yet Knox afterwards expressed remorse that he had dealt too favourably with the queen, and had not been more vehement in opposing the mass at its first setting up; according to the opinion of those who thought that a sovereign may and ought to be resisted in an idolatrous form of worship, or, in other words, excluded from the tolerance which her subjects claim as their dearest privilege.

Tumults arose at Stirling on the same score of the queen's private worship: but though Mary felt the injury and expressed her sense of it by weep-

[1561-1565 A.D.]

ing and sorrowing, yet she wisely passed it over, and trusted to the influence of her brother, who, by his great interest among the wiser sort of the reformers, by proclamations banishing the monks and friars, and other popular steps in favour of the reformed religion, procured a reluctant connivance at the celebration of the Catholic rites in the chapel royal. Mary, indeed, employed her brother as her first minister in all affairs, and especially in restoring quiet on the borders, where he executed many freebooters, and left England no cause of complaint.

The intercourse of Mary with that country had always stood upon a delicate and doubtful footing. Elizabeth was desirous that the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1560, which ended the war of the Reformation, should be formally ratified, particularly in respect of that article by which the queen of Scotland and her late husband had agreed to lay down, and never again to assume, the royal titles or arms of England. If Mary had complied with this clause without restriction, it would have been a virtual resignation of her right of succession to England through her grandmother, Margaret, daughter of Henry VII; a sacrifice which Queen Elizabeth was in no respect entitled to demand, nor Queen Mary disposed to grant. Lethington offered to ratify the clause of renunciation, if it were limited to Elizabeth's lifetime, which was all that was or could have been intended by the original treaty. But on the point of her successor Elizabeth was always desirous to preserve an affected obscurity, and to insist on entertaining any discussion involving that topic was to give her at all times the highest offence. Her ministers, therefore, were pertinacious in demanding that Queen Mary should resign in general terms all right whatever to the crown of England, without restriction either as to time or circumstances. While their envoys were engaged in these discussions, the two queens preserved a personal correspondence, in which high-flown and flighty professions of friendship and sisterly affection served to cloak, as is usual in such cases, the want of cordiality and sincerity which pervaded the intercourse of two jealous females, each suspicious of the other.^c

The reign of Mary Stuart and her immortal rivalry with Elizabeth of England have already been treated with such fulness in the chapters of English history devoted to this period, that only a bare outline of this fascinating drama will be given here. A figure of great importance was Mary's half-brother James, later made earl of Moray.^d

MARY STUART AS QUEEN AND PRISONER

The friendship between Mary and the earl of Moray which had been strained by religious differences, broke completely on the question of her marriage, for in spite of his bitter resistance she married a Catholic. Queen Elizabeth had not only refused to declare Mary Stuart her successor—a step which it was claimed would have ended their feud—but she proposed that her Scottish rival should marry her discarded lover, the earl of Leicester. Mary declined the suggestion, and on July 29th, 1565, married Lord Darnley, son of the exiled Catholic earl of Lennox, who had lately returned to Scotland. Darnley was the grandson of Henry VIII's sister Margaret, and was next to Mary herself in the English succession.

This marriage so strengthened the Catholic elements and consolidated the loyalists that the earl of Moray was forced into exile with various other nobles, and Mary with characteristic vigour crushed in their inception various Protestant uprisings by means of a swift armed excursion called the Roundabout (or Chaseabout) Raid. Her union with Darnley seems to have been

[1565-1568 A.D.]

at first a love-match as well as a triumph of state-craft, but her love speedily died in the face of his viciousness and weakness. She refused to grant him the royal title, and gave the Italian musician Rizzio, or Riccio, the post of chief adviser, and as Darnley claimed, of lover as well.

With Darnley's encouragement, a plot against Rizzio's life was entered into by Moray, Lennox, Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and others, and Rizzio was dragged from the very presence of Mary and slain March 9th, 1566. Moray and other exiles returned now, but the queen patching up a temporary truce with her cowardly husband fled to Dunbar where she gathered strength enough to frighten the exiles back to retirement. June 19th, 1566, the queen gave birth to a son who became James I of England after a series of dramatic events.

Mary had naturally nothing but contempt and hatred for her weak and vicious husband, and her impressionable heart fell under the sway of the even more vicious yet bold and resolute earl of Bothwell, who had befriended her at the time of Rizzio's murder. The assassination of Darnley on February 10th, 1567, and Mary's marriage with Bothwell, May 15th (though Bothwell was openly accused of her husband's murder), horrified all Scotland, and the degree of Mary's complicity still constitutes one of the mysteries of history. As both sides of the case have been fully recounted in our history of England it need not be reopened here.

So great was the revulsion of feeling in Scotland that Mary and her husband fled and raised an army which was met by the troops of the lords to whom Mary surrendered June 15th, 1567, on condition that Bothwell be allowed to escape. Bothwell left the country forever. Mary, brought back to Edinburgh a captive, was hooted and jeered by her subjects, and compelled to abdicate in favour of her son, James VI, with the earl of Moray as regent, July 24th, 1567. He returned from England to take control. The Hamiltons, however, so hated him that they took up Mary's cause and enabled her to demand the restoration of her crown. The issue was decided with finality in the battle of Langside, May 13th, 1568. Mary hopelessly defeated and in despair of her very life determined to seek refuge with her arch-enemy, the queen of England. Her subsequent detention, the conference concerning her guilt in the murder of Darnley in which her brother Moray appeared as her accuser, and her long imprisonment are all to be found at length in the record of Elizabeth's reign. We shall concern ourselves now only with the affairs of Scotland after the election of Moray to the regency.^a





CHAPTER XI

CROWN AGAINST KIRK

JAMES VI (1567-1625 A.D.)

The history of Scotland from the Reformation assumes a character not only unlike that of preceding times, but to which there is no parallel in modern ages. It became a contest, not between the crown and the feudal aristocracy, as before, nor between the asserters of prerogative and of privilege, as in England, nor between the possessors of established power and those who deemed themselves oppressed by it, as is the usual source of civil discord, but between the temporal and spiritual authorities, the crown and the church—that in general supported by the legislature, this sustained by the voice of the people. Nothing of this kind, at least in anything like so great a degree, has occurred in other Protestant countries—the Anglican church being, in its original constitution, bound up with the state as one of its component parts, but subordinate to the whole; and the ecclesiastical order in the kingdoms and commonwealths of the Continent being either destitute of temporal authority or at least subject to the civil magistrate's supremacy.—HENRY HALLAM.^b

THE REGENCY OF MORAY (1567-1570 A.D.)

MARY STUART, like Baliol, disappears personally from the field of Scottish history; but her life in exile, unlike his, was spent in busy plots to recover her lost throne. It became clear as time went on that she placed her whole reliance on the Catholic minority and foreign aid; even in prison she was a menace to Elizabeth and ready to plot against her as an enemy. But the Protestant party increased in Scotland until it became a majority almost representative of the whole nation; even her own son when he came to hold the sceptre, little inclined as he was to accept the Presbyterian principles, regarded her as a revolutionary element fortunately removed. By her will, confirmed by her last letters, she bequeathed the crown of Scotland and her claim to that of England to Philip II. The letters contain this modification

[1567-1569 A.D.]

only, that her son was to have an opportunity of embracing the Catholic faith under the guardianship of Philip to save his own throne. There was no such reservation as regards that of England. The Armada, from whose overthrow date the fall of Spain and the rise of Britain as the chief European power, was due to the direct instigation of Mary Stuart.

Meantime, in Scotland four regencies rapidly succeeded each other during the minority of James. The deaths by violence of two regents, Moray and Lennox, the suspicion of foul play in the death of the third, Mar, and the end scarcely less violent because preceded by a trial of the fourth, Morton, mark a revolutionary period and the impossibility of the attempted solution by placing the government in the hands of the most powerful noble. Hereditary royalty, not the rule of the aristocracy, was still dominant in Scottish politics, and a regency was an experiment already disparaged in the preceding reigns.



COSTUME OF TIME OF LORD DARNLEY

Moray, said Sir J. Melville,^c "was and is called the good regent," mingling with this praise only the slight qualification that in his later years he was apt to be led by flatterers, but testifying to his willingness to listen to Melville's own counsels. This epithet bestowed by the Protestants, whose champion he was, still adheres to him; but only partisans can justify its use. He displayed great promptness in baffling the schemes of Mary and her party, suppressed with vigour the border thieves, and ruled with a firm hand, resisting the temptation to place the crown on his own head. His name is absent from many plots of the time. He observed the forms of personal piety—possibly shared the zeal of the reformers, while he moderated their bigotry.

But the reverse side of his character is proved by his conduct. He reaped the fruits of the conspiracies which led to Rizzio's and Darnley's murders. He amassed too great a fortune from the estates of the church to be deemed a pure reformer of its abuses. He pursued his sister with a calculated animosity which would not have spared her life had this been necessary to his end or been favoured by Elizabeth. The mode of production of the casket letters and the false charges added by Buchanan,^d "the pen" of Moray, deprive Moray of any reasonable claim to have been an honest accuser, zealous only to detect guilt and to benefit his country. The reluctance to charge Mary with complicity in the murder of Darnley was feigned, and his object was gained when he was allowed to table the accusation without being forced to prove it. Mary remained a captive under suspicion of the gravest guilt, while Moray returned to Scotland to rule in her stead, supported by nobles who had taken part in the steps which ended in Bothwell's deed.

Moray left London on the 12th of January, 1569. During the year between his return and his death several events occurred for which he has been censured,

[1560-1570 A.D.]

but which were necessary for his security—the betrayal of the duke of Norfolk and of the secret plot for the liberation of Mary to Elizabeth; the imprisonment in Lochleven of the earl of Northumberland, who after the failure of his rising in the north of England had taken refuge in Scotland; and the charge brought against Maitland of Lethington of complicity in Darnley's murder. Lethington was committed to custody, but rescued by Kirkcaldy of Grange, who held the castle of Edinburgh, and while there "the chameleon," as Buchanan^d named Maitland in his famous invective, contrary to the nature of that animal, gained over those in the castle, including Kirkcaldy. Moray was afraid to proceed with the charge on the day of trial, and Kirkcaldy and Maitland became partisans of the queen. The castle was the stronghold of the queen's party—being isolated from the town and able to hold out against the regent who governed in the name of her son.

It has been suspected that Maitland and Kirkcaldy were cognisant of the design of Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh to murder Moray, for he had been with them in the castle. This has been ascribed to private vengeance for the ill-treatment of his wife; but the feud of the Hamiltons with the regent is the most reasonable explanation. As he rode through Linlithgow Moray was shot (the 23rd of January, 1570) from a window by Hamilton, who had made careful preparation for the murder and his own escape. Moray was buried in the south aisle of St. Giles cathedral, Edinburgh, amid general mourning. Knox preached the sermon, and Buchanan furnished the epitaph, both unstinted panegyrics.

His real character is as difficult to penetrate as that of Mary. It is easy for the historian to condemn the one and praise the other according to his own religious or political creed. It is nearer truth to recognise in both the graces and talents of the Stuart race, which won devoted followers, but to acknowledge that times in which Christian divines approved of the murder of their enemies were not likely to produce a stainless heroine or faultless hero, indeed necessitated a participation in deeds which would be crimes unless they can be palliated as acts of civil war. Let us absolve, if we can, Moray and Mary of Darnley's blood. It remains indisputable that Mary approved of Moray's assassination, and that Moray would have sanctioned Mary's death.^e

Hume Brown^e says: "The work accomplished by Moray has in large degree been overshadowed by the work of Knox, whose character and achievement were of a kind to make a wider appeal to the popular imagination. Yet of the two men it was Moray who indubitably did the most to insure the success of the Scottish Reformation."

Froude says of Moray: "When the verdict of plain human sense can get itself pronounced, the good regent will take his place among the best and greatest men who have ever lived. His lot had been cast in the midst of convulsions where, at any moment, had he cared for personal advantages, a safe and prosperous course lay open to him; but so far as his conduct can be traced, his interests were divided only between duty to his country, duty, as he understood it, to God, and affection for his unfortunate sister. France tried in vain to bribe him, for he knew that the true good of Scotland lay in alliance and eventual union with its ancient enemy. When his sister turned aside from the pursuit of thrones to lust and crime, Moray took no part in the wild revenge which followed. He withdrew from a scene where no honourable man could remain with life, and returned only to save her from judicial retribution. Only at last when she forced upon him the alternative of treating her as a public enemy or of abandoning Scotland to anarchy and ruin, he took his

final post at the head of all that was good and noble among his countrymen, and there met the fate which from that moment was marked out for him." f

THE REGENCIES OF LENNOX AND MAR (1570-1572 A.D.); THE DEATH OF KNOX

Moray was succeeded in the regency by Lennox, Darnley's father, the male nearest of kin to the future sovereign, but really the nominee of Elizabeth. His brief term of office was marked by the renewal of the English war under Sussex and other generals, which made the queen's cause again the more popular. Lennox, another victim of violence, was slain (the 3rd of September, 1571) in a hasty attack by one of the Hamiltons on Stirling, from which Morton, the real head of the Protestant party, who at first had been taken and threatened with the same fate, barely escaped. Mar, who had all along held the custody of the young king, was now chosen regent and held the post for a year, when he died, October, 1572. During his regency the civil war between the queen's and the king's party continued. An English intrigue was carried on with great mystery, and never brought to a point, by Randolph and Killigrew to deliver Mary to the regent that she might be tried within her own dominions.

On the death of Mar, Morton, who had been the most powerful noble during the last regency, at length reached the object of his ambition by being elected regent. On the day of Morton's election, October 24th, 1572, Knox died. If we condemn his violent language and bitter spirit, it is just to remember that he lived during the red heat of the struggle between Rome and the Reformation, and died before the triumph of the latter in Scotland was secure. He had felt the thongs of the galleys and narrowly escaped the stake. The massacre of St. Bartholomew, August 27th, 1572, spread consternation throughout Protestant Europe just before his last illness. Mary and Philip of Spain were still plotting for the destruction of all he held vital. His scheme for the reformation of the church and application of its revenues was in advance not of his own time only. He contemplated free education for children of the poor who really required such aid—a graduated system of parish schools, burgh schools, and universities, which would have forestalled the most recent educational reform. While he introduced Presbyterian government by kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assembly, and opposed even a modified Episcopacy, he saw the advantage of the superintendence of districts by the more learned and able clergy. While he insisted on the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments in the vulgar tongue, his liturgy shows his favour for forms of public prayer. Knox's first wife was English, and two of his sons took orders in the church of England. Scottish Presbyterianism had not yet been hardened by persecution into a hatred of prelacy as bitter as that of popery. It meant separation from Rome, but inclined to union with England, and the question of the form of church government was still open.^g

FROUDE'S ESTIMATE OF KNOX

No grander figure can be found, in the entire history of the Reformation in this island, than that of Knox. Cromwell and Burghley rank beside him for the work which they effected, but, as politicians and statesmen, they had to labour with instruments which soiled their hands in touching them. In purity, in uprightness, in courage, truth, and stainless honour, the regent

[1559-1572 A.D.]

Moray and our English Latimer were perhaps his equals; but Moray was intellectually far below him, and the sphere of Latimer's influence was on a smaller scale. The time has come when English history may do justice to one but for whom the Reformation would have been overthrown among ourselves; for the spirit which Knox created saved Scotland; and if Scotland had been Catholic again, neither the wisdom of Elizabeth's ministers, nor the teaching of her bishops, nor her own chicaneries, would have preserved England from revolution. His was the voice which taught the peasant of the Lothians that he was a free man, the equal in the sight of God with the proudest peer or prelate that had trampled on his forefathers. He was the one antagonist whom Mary Stuart could not soften nor Maitland deceive; he it was that raised the poor commons of his country into a stern and rugged people, who might be hard, narrow, superstitious, and fanatical, but who nevertheless were men whom neither king, noble, nor priest could force again to submit to tyranny. And his reward has been the ingratitude of those who should most have done honour to his memory.^f

CARLYLE'S ESTIMATE OF JOHN KNOX

In the history of Scotland I can find properly but one epoch; we may say, it contains nothing of world-interest at all but this Reformation by Knox. A poor barren country, full of continual broils, dissensions, massacres; a people in the last state of rudeness and destitution; hungry fierce barons, not so much as able to form any arrangement with each other *how to divide* what they fleeced from these poor drudges; but obliged to make of every alteration a revolution; no way of changing a ministry but by hanging the old ministers on gibbets; this is a historical spectacle of no very singular significance! Bravery enough, I doubt not; fierce fighting in abundance: but not braver or fiercer than that of their old Scandinavian Sea-king ancestors *whose* exploits we have not found worth dwelling on! It is a country as yet without a soul: nothing developed in it but what is rude, external, semi-animal. And now at the Reformation, the internal life is kindled, as it were, under the ribs of this outward material death.

This that Knox did for his Nation we may really call a resurrection as from death. It was not a smooth business; but it was welcome surely, and cheap at that price, had it been far rougher. On the whole, cheap at any price—as life is. The people began to *live*: they needed first of all to do that, at what cost and costs soever. Scotch Literature and Thought, Scotch Industry; James Watt, David Hume, Walter Scott, Robert Burns: I find Knox and the Reformation acting in the heart's core of every one of these persons and phenomena; I find that without the Reformation they would not have been. Or what of Scotland? The Puritanism of Scotland became that of England, of New England. A tumult in the High Church of Edinburgh spread into a universal battle and struggle over all these realms—there came out, after fifty-years struggling, what we all call the "*Glorious Revolution*," a *Habeas-Corpus* Act, Free Parliaments, and much else!

He is the one Scotchman to whom, of all others, his country and the world owe a debt. He has to plead that Scotland would forgive him for having been worth to it any million 'unblamable' Scotchmen that need no forgiveness! He bared his breast to the battle; had to row in French galleys, wander forlorn in exile, in clouds and storms; was censured, shot at through his windows; had a right sore fighting life; if this world were his place of recompense he had made but a bad venture of it.

[1550-1573 A.D.]

For one thing, I will remark that this post of Prophet to his Nation was not of his seeking; Knox had lived forty years quietly obscure before he became conspicuous. He had reached the age of forty; was with the small body of Reformers who were standing siege in St. Andrew's Castle, when one day in their chapel the preacher after finishing his exhortation to these fighters in the forlorn hope said suddenly that there ought to be other speakers, that all men who had a priest's heart and gift in them ought now to speak—which gifts and heart one of their own number, John Knox the

name of him, had. Poor Knox was obliged to stand-up; he attempted to reply; he could say no word; burst into a flood of tears and ran out. It is worth remembering that scene. He was in grievous trouble for some days. He felt what a small faculty was his for this great work. He felt what a baptism he was called to be baptised withal. He "burst into tears."

Our primary characteristic of a Hero, that he is sincere, applies emphatically to Knox. It is not denied anywhere that this, whatever might be his other qualities or faults, is among the truest of men. With a singular instinct he holds to the truth and fact; the truth alone is there for him, the rest a mere shadow and deceptive nonentity. However feeble, forlorn, the reality may seem, on that and that only *can* he take his stand.

He is an instance to us how a man, by sincerity itself, becomes heroic: it is the grand gift he has. We find in Knox a good honest intellectual talent, no transcendent one; a narrow, inconsiderable man,



MARY STUART
(1542-1587)

as compared with Luther: but in heartfelt instinctive adherence to truth, in *sincerity*, as we say, he has no superior; nay, one might ask, What equal he has? The heart of him is of the true Prophet cast. "He lies there," said the Earl of Morton at his grave, "who never feared the face of man." He resembles, more than any of the moderns, an Old-Hebrew Prophet. The same inflexibility, intolerance, rigid, narrow-looking adherence to God's truth, stern rebuke in the name of God to all that forsake truth: an Old-Hebrew Prophet in the guise of an Edinburgh Minister of the Sixteenth Century. We are to take him for that; not require him to be the other.

Knox's conduct to Queen Mary, the harsh visits he used to make in her own palace, to reprove her there, have been much commented upon. Such cruelty, such coarseness fills us with indignation. On reading the actual narrative of the business, what Knox said, and what Knox meant, I must say one's tragic feeling is rather disappointed. They are not so coarse, these speeches; they seem to me about as fine as the circumstances would

[1559-1572 A.D.]

permit! Knox was not there to do the courtier; he came on another errand. Whoever, reading these colloquies of his with the Queen, thinks they are vulgar insolences of a plebeian priest to a delicate high lady, mistakes the purport and essence of them altogether. It was unfortunately not possible to be polite with the Queen of Scotland, unless one proved untrue to the Nation and Cause of Scotland. A man who did not wish to see the land of his birth made a hunting-field for intriguing ambitious Guises, and the Cause of God trampled underfoot of Falsehoods, Formulas and the Devil's Cause, had no method of making himself agreeable! Knox was the constitutional opposition-party in Scotland: the Nobles of the country, called by their station to take that post, were not found in it; Knox had to go, or no one. The hapless Queen—but still the more hapless country, if *she* were made happy!

They blame him for pulling-down cathedrals, and so forth, as if he were a seditious, rioting demagogue: precisely the reverse is seen to be the fact in regard to cathedrals and the rest of it, if we examine! Knox wanted no pulling-down of stone edifices; he wanted leprosy and darkness to be thrown out of the lives of men. Tumult was not his element; it was the tragic feature of his life that he was forced to dwell so much in that.

Withal, unexpectedly enough, this Knox has a vein of drollery in him, which I like much in combination with his other qualities. He has a true eye for the ridiculous. His *History* with its rough earnestness is curiously enlivened with this. When the two Prelates entering Glasgow Cathedral quarrel about precedence, march rapidly up, take to hustling one another, twitching one another's rochets, and at last flourishing their crosiers like quarter-staves, it is a great sight for him everyway! Not mockery, scorn, bitterness alone; though there is enough of that, too. But a true, loving, illuminating laugh mounts up over the earnest visage; not a loud laugh, you would say; a laugh in the *eyes* most of all. An honest-hearted, brotherly man; brother to the high, brother also to the low; sincere in his sympathy with both. He had his pipe of Bordeaux, too, we find in that old Edinburgh house of his a cheery, social man, with faces that loved him!

They go far wrong who think this Knox was a gloomy, spasmodic, shrieking fanatic. Not at all: he is one of the solidest of men. Practical, cautious, hopeful, patient; a most shrewd, observing, quietly discerning man. In fact, he has very much the type of character we assign to the Scotch at present: a certain sardonic taciturnity is in him; insight enough, and a stouter heart than he himself knows of. He has the power of holding his peace over many things which do not vitally concern him; but the thing which does vitally concern him, that thing will he speak of—and in a tone the whole world shall be made to hear: all the more emphatic for his long silence.

This Prophet of the Scotch is to me no hateful man! He had a sore fight of an existence; wrestling with Popes and Principalities; in defeat, contention, life-long struggle; rowing as a galley-slave, wandering as an exile. A sore fight; but he won it. "Have you hope?" they asked him in his last moment, when he could no longer speak. He lifted his finger, "pointed upwards with his finger," and so died. Honour to him! His works have not died. The letter of his work dies, as of all men's; but the Spirit of it never.^a

BEGINNING OF THE REGENCY OF MORTON (1572 A.D.)

Morton possessed all Moray's faults in an exaggerated degree, many of his talents, but few or none of his virtues. He was ambitious, but his ambition was of that sordid kind that is sullied by avarice; and he was willing to

[1572-1573 A.D.]

stoop lower yet to win the favour of Elizabeth than Moray himself would have bowed. As a judge, he was accessible to bribery; as a soldier, he was a stranger to mercy; and it was from his name that those skirmishes, in which prisoners were regularly executed on both sides, were called "The Douglas Wars."

Morton showed how much he was the devoted servant of England, by delivering up to Elizabeth the banished earl of Northumberland, a nobleman to whom he had been personally obliged during his residence in England, and who was beheaded at York in 1572, for his rebellion in 1569. What rendered the regent's treachery more infamous was his acceptance of a reward in money for this service.

In the mean time Scotland bled at every vein. In the west Lord Claud Hamilton with infinite courage and zeal continued to uphold the sinking cause of Queen Mary. In the south, Buccleuch and Farniherst maintained the same side. In the north, Sir Adam Gordon, a son of that earl of Huntly who was killed in the battle of Corrichie, made war in the queen's behalf with distinguished success. Grange defended the castle of Edinburgh with his characteristic intrepidity. But notwithstanding the efforts of her adherents, the queen's cause declined in Scotland in every quarter, save Aberdeenshire. At length Huntly and the duke of Chastelherault consented to a treaty of peace, concluded at Perth the 23rd of February, 1573. By this treaty they agreed to acknowledge the authority of the king and the regent, and confessed the illegal character of all that they had done in the name of the queen. On the other hand, they and their followers were promised indemnity and remission of such dooms of forfeiture as had been launched against them. The adherents of the queen in other parts of Scotland acceded to this capitulation; and thus the banner of Mary sunk on all sides, save where it continued to float over Edinburgh castle.

The dauntless intrepidity of Kirkcaldy of Grange might have held out that strong fortress against all the force which the regent could muster within Scotland, ill supplied as it was with the means and skill necessary to carry on sieges. But, in conformity with her proclamation, Elizabeth sent Sir William Drury with a formidable train of artillery to assist in reducing the castle. Kirkcaldy held out with firmness worthy of his high military reputation, till his walls were breached and shattered, his provisions expended, the well choked with ruins and inaccessible, and the artillery silenced. At the last extremity he surrendered the place to Sir William Drury on a general promise of favourable terms. In this the English general had undertaken for more than he could make good. By Elizabeth's orders Sir William Drury saw himself obliged to surrender his prisoners to the vindictive regent. Morton caused the gallant Kirkcaldy and his brother to be executed at the cross of Edinburgh; and Maitland of Lethington, so long the sharer of his counsels, would have experienced as little mercy had not he taken poison and died, according to the expression of Melville,^c "in the Roman manner."

With the melancholy fate of Kirkcaldy, one of the boldest and most generous warriors, and Maitland, perhaps the most subtle and accomplished politician in Europe, we may conclude the history of Queen Mary's reign, since from that period no subject acknowledged her as sovereign.

The kingdom of Scotland, exhausted both in property and population, might have enjoyed a state of repose similar to the stupefaction of an exhausted patient, had it not been disturbed by the arbitrary and oppressive actions of the regent. Though affecting zeal for the Protestant doctrines, he disobliged the church of Scotland by a device which he had invented to

[1573-1579 A.D.]

secure in the hands of a secular nobility the lands and revenues of the Catholic clergy. For this purpose he nominated to the archbishopric of St. Andrews a poor clergyman named Douglas, taking his obligation to rest satisfied with a very small annuity out of the revenues of the see, and to account for the residue to his patron, the regent himself. This class of bishops, instituted for the purpose of cloaking some powerful lay lord in the enjoyment of the emoluments of the see, was facetiously called Tulchan¹ prelates; and both the clergy and their hearers execrated Morton's avarice, which had introduced the simoniacal practice.⁴

THE FALL OF MORTON, AND ACCESSION OF JAMES VI (1578 A.D.)

Morton, now without a rival, restored order in the borders, and when an encounter occurred between the English and Scottish borderers, called the Raid of the Redswyre [or Reidswire, July 7th, 1575] his prudence prevented it becoming a national conflict. He appointed a commission for the reform of the law—a far-sighted scheme, often attempted but always stopping short of success, to codify the law, which several continental states, notably Denmark, about this period engaged in. But while all seemed to favour Morton, there were undercurrents which combined to procure his fall. The Presbyterian clergy were alienated by his leaning to Episcopacy, and all parties in the divided church by his seizure of its estates. Andrew Melville, who had succeeded to the leadership of Knox, was more decided than Knox against any departure from the Presbyterian model, and refused to be won by a place in his household. His expensive buildings at Dalkeith, which got the name of "the lion's den," roused the jealousy of the nobles. The arrogance of his favourites exceeded his own. The commons were disgusted by a depreciation of the coinage. The powerful earl of Argyll—incensed by the recovery from his wife, the widow of Moray, of some of the crown jewels—and Athol, a Stuart and Roman Catholic, united with Alexander Erskine, governor of Stirling, who now had the custody of the young king, in a league which received so much support that Morton bent before the storm and offered to resign.

The king, whose education had been forced by Buchanan, now barely twelve years of age, nominally assumed the government, March 12th, 1578, but was directed by a council of nobles headed by Athol as chancellor. Morton surrendered the castle of Edinburgh, the palace of Holyrood, and the royal treasures, retiring to Lochleven, where he busied himself in laying out gardens. But his ambition could not deny itself another stroke for power. Aided by the young earl of Mar he got possession of Stirling Castle and the person of the king. Civil war was avoided only by the influence of Bowes, the English ambassador. A nominal reconciliation was effected, and a parliament at Stirling introduced a new government. Morton, who secured an indemnity, was president of the council, but Athol remained a privy councillor in an enlarged council with representatives of both parties. Shortly afterwards Athol died of poison, it was said, and suspicion pointed to Morton.

His return to power was brief, and the only important event was the prosecution of the two Hamiltons, the abbots of Arbroath and Paisley, who still supported Mary and saved their lives by flight to England.

¹ When a cow had lost her calf it was customary to flay the calf and stuff its skin with straw, that, being placed before the mother, it might induce her to part freely with her milk. This was called a Tulchan, and its resemblance to the stipendiary bishops introduced by Morton is sufficiently evident.

[1580-1582 A.D.]

The struggle with the Presbyterian clergy continued. The Second Book of Discipline had been presented to the king before he assumed office, and although the general assembly in 1580 condemned Episcopacy absolutely, parliament did not sanction the condemnation.

The final fall of Morton came from an opposite quarter. In September, 1579, Esmé Stuart, Lord d'Aubigny, the king's cousin, came to Scotland from France, gained the favour of James by his courtly manners, and received the lands and earldom of Lennox, the custody of Dumbarton Castle, and the office of chamberlain. One of his dependents, Captain James Stuart, son of Lord Ochiltree and brother-in-law of Knox, had the daring to accuse Morton at a meeting of the council in Holyrood of complicity in the murder of Darnley, and he was at once committed to custody. Some months later Morton was condemned by an assize for having taken part in that crime, and the verdict was justified by his confession that Bothwell had revealed to him the design, although he denied participation in its execution. He was executed by the Maiden—a guillotine he had himself brought from England—on the 2nd of June, 1581.

THE SWAY OF LENNOX AND ARRAN

From December, 1580, to August, 1582, the government was in the hands of Lennox and Stuart, now captain of the guard—a small force which the estates had reluctantly allowed the king to protect his person. Their jealousy threatened but never reached an open rupture. Stuart was rewarded by the gift first of the tutory, then of the earldom of Arran in April, 1581. Lennox was created duke, a title seldom granted in Scotland. Their aim, carefully concealed by nominal adherence to the Protestant faith, appears to have been the association of Mary with her son in the government, a breach with England, the renewal of the league with France, and the restoration of the Roman church. The nobles, bribed by office or the spoils of the church, were men of too feeble character to resist, but the Presbyterian ministers were made of stronger metal. Illegal banishment of the contumacious clergy and arbitrary orders of council were followed by a rising against Episcopacy. The proclamation of an extraordinary itinerant court of justice—to be held by Lennox at Edinburgh on the 27th of August—precipitated a *coup d'état*.⁹

The Ruthven Raid (August 22d, 1582)

The principal conspirators were the earls of Gowrie¹ and Mar, the master of Glamis, the lords Oliphant, Boyd, and Lindsay, the abbot of Dunfermline, secretary of state, and others who had been formerly allied with Morton and the English faction.

The time selected for executing this scheme was that which the king had chosen to enjoy the amusement of hunting in the country of Athol, so well suited for that sport. His favourite ministers did not attend him on this occasion. When, therefore, James returned from Athol towards the low country with a small train of his household servants it was natural that Gowrie should invite him to his castle of Ruthven, which lay in the king's road. James had no sooner arrived at Ruthven than his suspicions were awakened by the concourse of armed men who surrounded the castle.

¹ He was son of that lord Ruthven who played the principal part in Rizzio's murder, and who was so little affected with remorse for his share in that tragedy, that on his death-bed he spoke with great coolness of "the slaughter of David."

[1582-1583 A.D.]

The principal persons concerned in the enterprise entered James' bedroom in a body and delivered to him a petition or remonstrance, setting forth that they, the king's faithful subjects, had for the space of two years suffered such false accusations, calumnies, oppressions, and persecutions, by means of the duke of Lennox and of the person who assumed the title of earl of Arran, that like insolence and enormities had never been heard of in Scotland. Their manifesto further stated that their persecution was felt by the whole body of the commonwealth, but chiefly by the ministers of the Gospel, and the true professors thereof; and that while men who had been attached to his majesty's service during his youth were, though the king's best subjects, driven into banishment, and many of those who remained were subjected to partial prosecutions and oppression, and while all of them were grossly calumniated, and violently excluded from the presence of the sovereign, they saw with indignation that papists and notable murderers were, on the other hand, daily called home from deserved exile, and either restored to such property as they had before enjoyed, or compensated by gifts out of the estates of the king's faithful subjects.

The same remonstrance charged Lennox and Arran with involving the king in plots and confederacies with the pope, the king of Spain, and the French papists, and with the bishops of Glasgow and Ross, the adherents of his mother, Queen Mary, by whom he was urged to effect her freedom from imprisonment, and associate her with himself in the royal authority.

After vain expostulation the king burst into tears. "Let him weep," said Glammis fiercely: "better children weep than bearded men [better bairns greet than bearded men'"]. These words sunk deep into the king's heart; and though generally of a placable disposition, the insult which they contained was never forgotten or forgiven.

For the present, however, James was compelled to submit to his fate, and to subscribe and issue a proclamation declaring his purpose, by his own free consent, to remain for some time in the province of Strathearn with such lords as were then around him. When the news of this change of ministry, as it may be called—for such rude violence was in Scotland the frequent mode for transferring political power—reached the two favourites against whom it was chiefly levelled, each of them behaved in a manner indicative of his character. The earl of Arran, as daringly rash as he was unprincipled and ambitious, rode headlong towards Ruthven Castle. He was not permitted, of course, to approach the person of the king, but on the contrary made prisoner, and thrown into a dungeon. The protection of the earl of Gowrie who was destined, it would seem, to save the life of him who finally brought his head to the block, occasioned the favourite to be detained prisoner, and his life preserved, to be a principal author of future state commotions.

The duke of Lennox, without making any attempt to restore the state of administration which had been altered by the enterprise now popularly called the raid¹ of Ruthven, capitulated and endeavoured to obtain liberty to return to court. This was refused, he was commanded to leave Scotland and at length returned to France by the way of London. Trouble of mind brought on a fever in May, 1583, which terminated his life at Paris. He died, declaring his sincere adherence to the Protestant faith, and refusing the succours of the Catholic church, in contradiction to the calumnies which had such general circulation in Scotland.⁴

¹ Raid signifies properly an inroad of a predatory character. But the Scottish applied it generally to any multitude assembled in arms for a violent purpose.

JAMES CLAIMS CHURCH SUPREMACY; THE BLACK ACTS (1584 A.D.)

The government was for ten months in the hands of a new council, of which Gowrie as treasurer was the head. There was no parliament, but a convention at Holyrood, October 9th, ratified the consequences of the raid of Ruthven [restored the thirds to the church, and revived the laws against the papists]. A declaration was extorted from the king condoning his capture, but James, no longer a boy, chafed under the tutelage of the Protestant nobles and the admonitions of the Protestant ministers. In June of the following year he escaped from Falkland to St. Andrews, which was held by Colonel Stewart. Arran was recalled, August 5th, 1583, the raid of Ruthven declared treason, Gowrie executed, and the chief Protestant lords banished. Melville and other ministers found it necessary to fly to England. A parliament, May 22nd, 1584, confirmed the supremacy of Arran, who was created chancellor, and the forfeiture of the chief persons implicated in the Ruthven raid.^o

The king's authority over all persons, and in all cases whatsoever, was formally confirmed. "The declining his majesty's judgment and that of the council, in whatsoever matter, was," says Spottiswoode,¹ "declared to be treason. The impugning the authority of the three estates, or procuring the innovation or diminution of the power of any of them, was inhibited under the same pain. All jurisdictions and judicatures, spiritual or temporal, not approved of by his highness and the three estates were discharged, and an ordinance made that none of whatsoever function, quality, or degree, should presume, privately or publicly, in sermons, declamations, or familiar conferences, to utter any false, untrue, or slanderous speeches to the reproach of his majesty, his council, and proceedings, or to the dishonour, hurt, or prejudice of his highness, his parents and progenitors, or to meddle with the affairs of his highness and estate, under the pains contained in the acts of parliament made against the makers and reporters of lies." The church of Scotland was by these sweeping enactments [called "the Black Acts"] totally altered in its constitution and privileges. A change which we must regard in a very different light, if we consider the privileges which they claimed theoretically, or look at their practical effects.

In the first point of view there appears no political wisdom in rendering a body like the clergy, set apart for duties inconsistent with the bustle of active life, the depositaries of a nation's liberty, otherwise than in matters of religious doctrine and conscience. But though such a charge was an anomaly, it was still more essential to the liberties of the nation that a power of reminding the subjects of their rights and the rulers of their duty should exist somewhere, than that it should be lodged in those hands which might be theoretically preferred as the most expedient and best. The Scottish parliament were indeed, in theory, the natural and proper guardians of the people's freedom.⁴

A commission was granted to Patrick Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews, and other bishops for trying ecclesiastical causes, and a form of judgment was established for depriving ministers of their benefices for worthy causes. A declaration¹ was required to be subscribed by all beneficed men—ministers,

[¹ A letter has been discovered which shows the strong but secret Catholic feelings of James. Martin Hume^k gives it in his *Spanish State Papers*, and it was written apparently on James' personal authority from Holyrood, February 19th, 1584, directly to the pope. It makes a frank appeal for papal support and promises "to satisfy your Holiness on all other points, especially if your Holiness aids me in my great necessity." It throws a garish light on the duplicity of the king.]

[1585 A.D.]

readers, masters of colleges and schools—acknowledging their submission to the king and obedience to their ordinary bishop or superintendent appointed by him under pain of forfeiture. A few subscribed unconditionally, others with the qualification, “according to the Word of God”; but a large number declined and suffered the penalty.

Early in 1585 Adamson issued a paper declaring the king’s supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, defending the restoration of bishops, and announcing the king’s intention that the bishops should hold synods twice a year, that general assemblies should be allowed provided they had his sanction, but that no jurisdiction was to be exercised by presbyteries. This document, which cut at the root of the Presbyterian system and was a formal declaration in favour of the royal supremacy and Episcopacy, was met with vehement protests by Melville and the exiled ministers.

Meantime a series of intrigues went on between the English and Scottish courts. Elizabeth, while ostensibly favouring the exiles, disliked their political principles. James and Arran, instead of leaning on the papacy as Mary did, had shown signs of accepting a solution of the problem of church government more like that of England than of Geneva. There was here ground for a compromise of the religious controversy which political reasons made so desirable. Accordingly, Lord Hunsdon, a favourite courtier of Elizabeth, met Arran near Berwick in the autumn, when it was arranged that the master of Gray, then a follower of Arran and personal favourite of James, should go to London in October. At his instance Elizabeth removed the banished Scottish lords and ministers from Newcastle to London. But Gray was playing his own game, and his suggestions that these lords might return to Scotland, and that the alliance with England should be carried out by their aid and his own influence independently of Arran, were taken up by the queen, who had no personal liking for Arran, and ultimately effected. Elizabeth sent Wotton to Scotland, who won the confidence of James to whom he promised a pension of £5,000 a year, and while openly negotiating with Arran secretly plotted with Gray for his downfall. A mutual league between England and Scotland against the Catholics, called the “bond anent the true religion,” was agreed to by a convention of estates in July, 1585.

THE ALLIANCE WITH ELIZABETH (1585 A.D.)

This was a turning-point in the life of James and in the history of Scotland. The choice was made between France and England, Romanism and Protestantism. It was not likely to be reversed when with Elizabeth’s declining years the crown of England was thrown into the balance. The day before the conclusion of the treaty Arran was at the request of Elizabeth’s envoy put in strict ward, under the pretext that he had been privy to the death of Lord Russell, son of the earl of Bedford, in a border fray, and he only escaped at the price of his estates and honours.

In November the banished lords—Angus, Mar, the master of Glamis—returned, and along with them the two Hamiltons; and aided by Gray, they seized the person of the king and the castle of Stirling, and assumed the government. The alliance with England was finally ratified at Berwick by Randolph. James, at the instigation of Gray, wrote a harsh letter to his mother; and at the instance of Elizabeth he allowed George Douglas, who had been concerned in Darnley’s murder, to return to Scotland. The exiled Protestant ministers were restored to their livings; but James was resolute in maintaining Episcopacy and enforcing the laws against all who denied the royal supremacy.

[1585-1588 A.D.]

Adamson was, indeed, forced by a general assembly to disclaim any authority as archbishop not allowed by God's Word, and an act was passed again dividing Scotland into presbyteries, but the king refused to subject the bishops to their jurisdiction.

Mary, deserted by her son, now allowed herself through her immediate confidants, especially her secretaries, Nau and Curle, to take an active though secret part in the Jesuit plots which embraced both Scotland and England in their ramifications. Her trial at Fotheringay could have had but the one result, as described in our history of England. The execution (February 8th, 1587) of Mary naturally roused the anger of the Catholic powers and some indignation in Scotland, which James professed to share; yet he did nothing but expostulate. In truth, his own crown was threatened by the same enemies. Mary had disinherited him in favour of Philip of Spain, unless he adopted the Catholic faith.

The defeat of the Spanish Armada by the sovereign and people of both countries was felt to be a providential deliverance. Nothing could have served better to efface the memory of Mary and extinguish pity for her fate.^a

SCOTLAND AND THE ARMADA (1588 A.D.)

In the present crisis, when the Spanish invasion was expected at any moment, James weighed in most careful balance the two policies of an English or a Spanish alliance. He finally decided to cling to England, and so declared himself in terms that implied no previous doubt.^a Universal preparations were made for resistance in case the Spaniards should attempt to land in Scotland. There was a general muster through the realm. Watches were placed at all the sea-ports, beacons erected, and every means taken to prepare the most effectual defence against the apprehended invasion. In the mean time love of the old religion, or desire for new changes by which they might profit, had associated a few of the Scottish lords into a faction favourable to Spain, and formidable from the rank and power of those whom it included. The earls of Huntly, Errol, and Crawford, and Lord Maxwell, were all Catholics.

Maxwell had retreated to Spain in discontent, and at this crisis returned with the purpose of assisting the Spanish king's enterprise by making an insurrection in Scotland. He went suddenly, therefore, to the west border, and began to assemble his forces; but James, placing himself at the head of a body of troops, made a rapid movement into Nithsdale, where he dispersed the forces of Maxwell, took him prisoner, and seized upon his castles.

With the exception of these nobles, Scotland in general showed the firmest determination to support the king. A bond of association was entered into for the maintenance of true religion and defence of their lawful sovereign. This association was signed with emulous alacrity by subjects of every rank, and was the model upon which the celebrated League and Covenant in the reign of Charles I was afterwards founded, though for very different purposes.

The fate of the Invincible Armada in 1588 is generally known. Persecuted by the fury of the elements, and annoyed by the adventurous gallantry of the English seamen, it was driven around the island of Britain, meeting great loss upon every quarter, and strewing the wild shores of the Scottish Highlands and isles with wreck and spoil. James, though in arms to resist the Spaniards, had such resistance been necessary, behaved generously to considerable numbers whom their misfortunes threw upon his shores. Their wants were relieved, and they were safely restored to their own country.

The fate of one body of these unfortunate men is strikingly told by the

[1588-1592 A.D.]

reverend James Melville,¹ whose graphic diary has been published.¹ He describes at some length the alarm caused by the threatened invasion, and its effects. "Terrible," he says, "was the fear, piercing were the preachings, earnest, zealous, and fervent were the prayers, sounding were the sighs and sobs, and abounding were the tears at the fast and general assembly at Edinburgh, where we were credibly told sometimes of their landing at Dunbar, sometimes at St. Andrews, and again at Aberdeen and Cromarty."

On a sudden these rumours were dispelled by the account that a shipful of Spaniards were arrived in Melville's own harbour of Anstruther. The minister hastened to meet them, and found himself in presence of Don Juan de Medina, a commodore of twenty vessels. He was a reverend man of tall stature, a grave and silent countenance, great beard, and so humbled by his condition that in bowing to the clergyman he swept his shoe with his sleeve. His tale was most melancholy. They had been shipwrecked upon the Fair Isle between Orkney and Shetland, had experienced the utmost extremity of hunger and cold, had after some weeks of misery hired a bark from Orkney, and were now come to entreat protection from the king of Scotland.

He and his men were accordingly treated with honourable kindness by the people of Anstruther. Melville procured for the Spaniards' information a printed account of the dispersion of the Armada, and their numerous losses in the north seas. He burst into tears and wept bitterly. Having set forth on his return to his own country, the noble Castilian found a ship belonging to the town of Anstruther under arrest at Cadiz. He instantly undertook a journey to court to labour for her discharge, and reported to his monarch his high sense of the Scottish hospitality. The vessel being liberated he showed great kindness to the crew, and dismissed them with many commendations to the good people of Anstruther. "But," concludes Melville,¹ very naturally, "we thanked God with our hearts that we had seen them among us in that form."

Thus passed over in Britain that dreadful period of 1588, which the astrologers, whom chance had for once guided to a veracious prediction, had distinguished as the "marvellous year."

THE "SPANISH BLANKS"

When the danger was over, Elizabeth no longer evinced any thought of making good the liberal promises made to the king of Scots by her envoy while matters were yet doubtful.

The Catholic lords themselves, though much disconcerted by the failure of the Armada, continued to negotiate with the prince of Parma, soliciting him for a body of six thousand auxiliaries, by means of whom, added to their own followers, they proposed to make him master of Scotland, and enable him to enter England with a triumphant army. Huntly, Crawford, and Errol were the chief persons in this conspiracy; but they were joined by Francis, earl of Bothwell, a turbulent and ambitious man, who alone of the Scotch Protestant nobility had advised a war with England, and even engaged soldiers to follow him in it at his own expense. Their correspondence with the prince of Parma being discovered to Elizabeth in 1592, she commanded Sidney to lay the letters before the king of Scotland. [Their papers were eight blank sheets, according to Burton,^m signed by the conspirators and later to have been filled with promises to support an invasion.] The guilty noblemen

¹ He was a clergyman, and must be carefully distinguished from Sir James Melville,^e the statesman often quoted. His diary has been published by the Bannatyne Club of Edinburgh.

[1587-1590 A.D.]

were condemned to imprisonment; but King James, who was not willing to encounter the odium of the Catholic party lest it should interfere with his claim of succession to the throne of England, and who might in his heart desire to reserve some power in Scotland itself to balance the violent Protestant party acting under the instigation of preachers always unfavourable to him and his family, released the rebellious earls after a short confinement.¹

They testified their thankfulness for his clemency, first, by an attempt to seize his person, which was disconcerted by the precautions of the chancellor; secondly, by an open rebellion in the north of Scotland. The king marched against them with an army hastily collected; and the rebels, unable to withstand the royal forces, dispersed their troops, and submitted to James' clemency. Once more they were committed to prison, once more to experience the lenity of their sovereign, who took an opportunity again to release them, in consequence of his marriage.⁴

JAMES' MARRIAGE; HIS GROWING AUTOCRACY IN THE CHURCH

The fall of Gray, who had been tried and condemned in 1587 for treachery during his English embassy and for correspondence with Catholic princes, had left James, now of full age, without what was almost a necessity to his weak nature—a favourite, though Sir John Maitland, a younger brother of Lethington, was secretary and exercised the chief influence in the government. Advantage had been taken of the royal majority to pass in 1587 an act annexing to the crown all church lands under certain limited reservations. But, as all prior grants to lay impropiators were saved, and the king was still allowed to grant feus of church lands, the nobles and landed gentry really profited most by this measure, which gave a parliamentary title to their estates derived from the church and the hope of future spoils. The act was accompanied by a general revocation of all gifts made during the king's minority or by Mary after her accession. Another statute of constitutional importance renewed, and for the first time carried into effect, the law of James I, by which the lesser barons in the counties were excused from personal attendance and allowed to send representatives to parliament. This was a check on the nobles who had hitherto almost exclusively attended and ruled parliament. It was the first and only large deviation of the Scottish parliament from the feudal model of the *curia regis*.

Projects for the king's marriage had been on foot at an earlier period; but at last the choice fell upon Anne of Denmark. Elizabeth opposed the match; but James, perhaps tempted by the offer to surrender the Danish claim to Orkney and Shetland, perhaps also not unwilling to show he could choose for himself, was married to Anne by proxy, August 20th, 1589. Anne set sail for Scotland, but was driven back by a storm. Accordingly James himself went to claim his bride, when the actual marriage was at once celebrated at Copenhagen, where he spent the winter. It was a political advantage both to the king and to Scotland to form a connection with a kingdom which, though small, stood comparatively high at that time in Europe, and was completely independent both of England and of France.

After the king's return, May, 1590, the Presbyterian party was in the ascendant. It has been doubted whether the favour shown to it by James

[¹ The discovery of James' letter to the pope and other secret state papers prove that James himself hoped to gain by the Spanish invasion, and hesitated long before throwing his lot in with Elizabeth. His protection of the Catholic earls was therefore, in a real sense, the protection of accomplices in a plot which he had begun but deserted.]

[1590-1596 A.D.]

at this time was genuine, but without reason. He had been married, and the queen was crowned, May 17th, by Robert Bruce, a leading minister, for whom he had a personal liking. Shortly before going to Denmark James had published a tract interpreting the Apocalypse in the well-known Protestant sense. Notwithstanding the failure of the Armada, the air was still full of Jesuit intrigues and Spanish plots.

At no moment of his life was James less inclined towards the English form of the Reformation, which he described in a celebrated speech as retaining the superstition of the mass "without the liftings." A severe blow was given to Episcopacy in Scotland by Archbishop Adamson, shortly before his death, retracting in a published confession his writings against Presbyterianism. In 1592 parliament, led according to James Melville¹ by Maitland, now Lord Thirlestane and chancellor, re-established Presbyterian church government. General assemblies were to meet once a year, and provincial assemblies or synods, presbyteries, and sessions were confirmed. The act of 1584 conferring jurisdiction on bishops was rescinded, but there was no formal abrogation of the office. The assembly had asked for the repeal of the Act of Annexation of 1587, but this was not conceded. The landed interests were too powerful to allow of the Reformed church receiving the patrimony of its predecessor. Shortly after the termination of the parliament the discovery of the plot of "the Spanish blanks," already described, had showed that the danger of a Catholic rising and foreign invasion was real. The conspiracy proved abortive, as we have seen, and two of its chief promoters (Huntly and Errol) left Scotland; on their return three years later they publicly renounced Catholicism and conformed to the Protestant faith.

From the king's majority to his accession to the English throne his relations to the nobles on the one hand and to the Presbyterian party, led by the ministers, on the other, require to be kept in view as giving the key to a singularly confused and changing course of events. After the death of Thirlestane in 1595, the king had to rely on his own counsel, of the value of which he had an overweening opinion. He had studied the theory of kingcraft and wrote the *Basilicon Doron* expounding it. He fancied that he really governed, while he was in fact drawn this way or that by the contending forces which emerged in this revolutionary epoch. In spite of occasional displays of resolution, his character was at bottom weak. It was the destiny which conducted him to the English throne that saved him from the dangers of his situation in Scotland.

BOTHWELL: THE OCTAVIANS

A nobleman who, although only connected by his mother with Mary's Bothwell, seemed to inherit the reckless daring of his predecessor in the title, thrice attempted and once (July 24th, 1593) for a short time succeeded in seizing the royal person and assuming the reigns of government. But James, who was not without adroitness in baffling plotters by arts similar to their own, escaped from his custody. Towards the Catholic lords his policy was not to proceed to extremities, but to keep them in hand as a counterpoise to the extreme Protestant party.

He prudently allowed the finances to be managed after Thirlestane's death in 1596 by a committee, appointed January 8th, called from its number the Octavians, on which both Catholics and Protestants acted—Seton, afterwards Lord Dunfermline, the president of the session, and Lindsay of Balcarres being the leading members. With their advice James set himself against any measures which the Protestant ministers proposed for the restoration or

[1596 A.D.]

increase of the revenues of the church. It was this critical point of money, the assertion of the royal supremacy in spiritual matters, and the favour the king showed to the Catholics which led to the quarrel between him and the ministers. At a convention of the estates at Falkland, and then more strongly as one of a deputation sent by the ministers from Cupar, Andrew Melville, in the spirit and manner of Knox, made his well-known speech to "God's silly vassal" on the two kingdoms and the two kings.^o

ANDREW MELVILLE REBUKES THE KING, SEPTEMBER, 1596

The king angrily charged that meeting with being seditious, and accused them of stirring up alarm in the country when none was needed. Andrew Melville kindled at the king's charge of sedition against the brethren. Taking the king by the sleeve, and addressing him with the epithet of "God's silly vassal," he thundered in his ears to the following effect:

"Sir, we will humbly reverence your majesty always, namely, in public; but we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and you are brought into extreme danger both of your life and of your crown, and with you the country and kirk of God is like to be wrecked for not telling the truth and giving you a faithful counsel. We must discharge our duty, or else be enemies of Christ and you; therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now I must tell you that there are two kings and two kingdoms. There is Christ and his kingdom the kirk, whose subject King James VI is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a head, nor a lord, but a member; and they whom Christ hath called and commanded to watch over his kirk and govern his spiritual kingdom have sufficient authority and power from him so to do, which no Christian king nor prince should control nor discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects to Christ. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clouts, Christ reigned freely in this land in spite of all his enemies.



JAMES VI OF SCOTLAND
(1560-1625)

"The wisdom of your counsel, which is devilish and pernicious, is this—that you may be served with all sorts of men to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant. Because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are too strong, and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low by stirring up a party against them, and the king, being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to flee to him; so shall he be well settled. But, sir, let God's wisdom be the only true wisdom: this will prove mere and mad folly; for his curse cannot but light upon it, so that in seeking both you shall lose both; whereas, in cleaving uprightly to God, his true servants shall be your true friends, and he shall compel the rest, counterfeitly and lyingly, to serve you, as he did to David."

We can imagine with what feeling Elizabeth or her father would have listened to such sentiments, and enforced in such a fashion; but the arguments were nothing more than the legitimate consequences of an ecclesiastical

[1596-1600 A.D.]

polity which James himself had recognised; and as for the blunt mode in which his attention had been solicited, it was too much in accordance with the simple fashions of a Scottish court to excite either wonder or alarm. While Elizabeth, therefore, would have called for her guards, or Henry VIII shouted for the executioner, James only listened quietly, as to an expected lesson, although this was but a part of the harangue, and "demitted them pleasantly," declaring his ignorance of the return of the popish lords. All this courtesy, however, on the part of the king was but an empty show."

Although James, frightened by this vehement language, made promises that he would do nothing for the Catholic lords till they had made terms with the church, it was impossible that a quarrel whose roots were so deep as to the limits of the royal authority and jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical could be appeased. Neither party to it could see how far each overstepped the bounds of reason. The king was blind to the right of freedom of conscience which Protestantism had established as one of its first principles. Melville and the ministers were equally blind to the impossibility of any form of monarchy yielding to the claim that the members of an ecclesiastical assembly should use the name of Christ and the theory of his headship over the church to give themselves absolute power to define its relations to the state.

Other occasions quickly arose for renewing the controversy. A violent sermon by Black at St. Andrews gave a favourable opportunity to James of invoking the jurisdiction of the privy council, and the preacher was banished north of the Tay. Soon afterwards a demand made on the king in consequence of a sermon of another minister, Balcanquhal, and a speech of Bruce's—the king's former favourite—that he should dismiss the Octavians, led to a tumult in Edinburgh, December 17th, 1596, which gave James a pretext for leaving the town and removing the courts of justice to Linlithgow.' Supported by the nobles, he returned on New Year's Day, 1597, received the submission of the town, levying a severe fine before he would restore its privileges as a corporation, and withholding from it the right of electing its own magistrates or ministers without the royal consent.

Emboldened by this success, James now addressed himself to the difficult problem of church and state. He did not yet feel strong enough to restore Episcopacy—perhaps had not quite determined on that course. The ingenious scheme—due to Lindsay of Balcarres—was invented of the introducing representatives of the church into parliament without naming them bishops. This would have the twofold effect of diminishing the authority of the general assemblies and of conferring on parliament a competency to deal with matters ecclesiastical.

Parliament in 1597 passed an act that all ministers promoted to prelaties (i.e., bishoprics or abbacies) should have seats in parliament, and remitted to the king with the general assembly to determine as to the office of such persons in the spiritual policy and government of the kirk. Accordingly James summoned successive assemblies at Perth and Dundee, where there were two sessions in 1597, and finally at Montrose, in 1600, selecting those towns in order to procure a good attendance from the north, always more favourable to royalty and Episcopacy and less under the influence of the Edinburgh clergy. By this and other manœuvres he obtained some concessions, but not all that he desired. It was the Gowrie conspiracy (the 5th

[Hume Brown* calls this "a turning point in the reign of James VI. By his astuteness and pertinacity he turned the tumult of the day to so good account that he gradually attained to a degree of authority over all classes of his subjects, such as had been acquired by no previous ruler of Scotland."]

[1600 A.D.]

of August, 1600) whose failure gave him the courage and the ground for finally abandoning the Presbyterians and casting in his lot with the bishops. Repeated investigations at the time and since cannot be said to have completely cleared up the mystery of this outrage.⁹

THE PUZZLE OF THE GOWRIE CONSPIRACY (1600 A.D.)

The correspondence of Essex with King James VI was certainly amongst the causes which prevented his restoration to the favour of Elizabeth. The harshness with which he was treated in the autumn of 1600 was a natural consequence of the indignation of the English government at the proceedings of James. At a convention of the Scottish estates, in June of that year, the king proposed that a tax should be levied for the purpose of asserting his claim to the succession to the crown of England. This demand met with the most strenuous resistance. Amongst those who led the opposition was the young earl of Gowrie, who had recently returned from the court of Elizabeth. The king was furious against his parliament. They had laughed at his notion of raising money to make a conquest of England; and altogether refused to give him more than 40,000 pounds Scots. After this Essex was informed that James had a party in England, and intended not to wait for the queen's death. The mutual ill-will that subsisted at this time between James and Elizabeth has led to the belief, resting upon very insufficient foundation, that what is called the Gowrie plot may be traced to the contrivance of the English queen.

The facts which are commonly related are briefly these: On the morning of the 5th of August, 1600, James was going forth from his palace at Falkland to hunt, when Alexander Ruthven, the younger brother of Gowrie, desired to speak with him privately. He whispered something about an unknown man having found a pot of gold; and the treasure, which was in Gowrie House, at Perth, might be seen by the king if he would come thither without his attendants. The scent of gold was irresistible to James. After the chase he rode off to Perth with young Ruthven; but he was ultimately joined by his attendants. James dined alone [the dinner seems to have been poor and late, indicating lack of preparation]. After dinner Gowrie, with James' suite, went into the pleasure garden.

Alexander Ruthven then told the king it was now time to go and look at the gold. They went together through various apartments, Ruthven locking the doors as they passed along. At length they reached a small round room; and then Ruthven, removing a curtain, disclosed a portrait of his father, and asked James who murdered him. [He seized a dagger from Henderson, a mysterious stranger found in the room.] He held the dagger to the king's breast and said that if he made any attempt to open the window or to cry out the dagger should be in his heart. Young Ruthven left the king alone with Henderson. James appealed to Henderson for protection. Ruthven, soon returning, ran upon the king and attempted to bind him.

A desperate struggle ensued, in which James managed to reach the window and cry out for help. Lennox and the other courtiers in the garden saw the king's flushed face at the window, as he uttered the cry of "Treason!" Some rushed up the great staircase, but found the door locked. Ramsay, one of the suite, remembered a back stair; and reaching the door of the round chamber dashed it open, and found the king still struggling with Ruthven. Ramsay stabbed the youth, who was quickly despatched by others who came up the turnpike-stair. Gowrie himself, with his servants, having seen the

[1600 A.D.]

dead body of his brother, rushed frantically to the gallery where some of the attendants of James were assembled, and was quickly slain. The populace in the streets of Perth were roused to madness when they heard of the deaths of the two Ruthvens; and they cried to the king as he looked out, "Come down, thou son of Signor Davie; thou hast slain a better man than thyself." Some of the preachers of the kirk maintained that the king conspired against the Gowries, and not the Gowries against the king; and this belief was by no means confined to the Presbyterian ministers.^o

Three friends and servants of the earl of Gowrie who had assisted him in his battles with the king's retinue and were afterwards officious and active in the tumult, were tried, condemned, and executed, protesting with their last breath they knew nothing about the transactions of the day further than that they took part with their master. Viewed in every light, the conspiracy seemed to the public one of the darkest and most extraordinary which ever agitated the general mind; and it cannot be wondered that very different conclusions were formed concerning it. The king was particularly touched in point of honour in making good his own story, but experienced no small difficulty from the mystery which hung over the bloody incident. Faction and religious prejudice lent their aid to disturb men's comprehension of what was in itself so mystical.

Many doubted the king's report altogether, and conceived it more likely that the brothers should have fallen by some deceit on the part of the king and court, than that they should have attempted treason against the life or liberty of the sovereign in circumstances so very improbable. Many of the clergymen particularly continued to retain most absolute incredulity upon the subject; and he was thought no bad politician who found an evasion by saying that he believed the story because the king told it, but that he would not have given credit to his own eyes had he seen it.

The ministers of Edinburgh were peculiarly resolute in refusing to give avowed credit to the king's account of the conspiracy, and took the most public measures to show their incredulity. The council having required them to return solemn thanks from their pulpits for the deliverance of James, they excused themselves, saying that they had no acquaintance with the particulars of the danger which the king was said to have escaped. An order for a solemn and public thanksgiving on a day fixed was then sent forth, and the divines who should scruple to perform the duty of the day were threatened with banishment. Most of the recusants submitted after some altercation. All the clergy at length submitted to the king's pleasure, except the reverend Robert Bruce. He was banished for his incredulity and repaired to France.

The parliament, by giving the fullest credit to the king's account of the accident, may be supposed to have designed to console him for the incredulity of the clergy. They heard the witnesses upon the trial, and not only pronounced sentence of forfeiture against the deceased brothers, but disinherited their whole posterity and proscribed the very name of Ruthven. Honourable rewards and titles were bestowed on Sir Thomas Erskine, Sir John Ramsay, and Sir Hugh Harris, who had been the instrument of James' preservation. Alms were dispersed, and every other means adopted which could impress upon the people the reality of the king's danger and the sincerity of his gratitude to Heaven for a providential deliverance. But it is an observation of Tacitus that one of the misfortunes of princes is that conspiracies against them are not believed until they are carried into fatal effect. A considerable party in James' kingdom, thinking, perhaps, better of his audacity and worse of his morals than either the one or the other deserved, still refused to

believe that the king's danger had been real, or the death of Gowrie and his brother on the memorable 5th of August excusable.

Their arguments rested upon the string of improbabilities of which it is impossible to divest the story, and which, indeed, can be refuted only by opposing to them the greater difficulties which attend the embracing a different solution.⁴ Like the mystery of Mary Stuart's complicity in Darnley's murder, it becomes the more puzzling the more it is studied, and every theory is confronted with objections based on common sense and human nature. James was a notorious liar, and his own evidence is of little value uncorroborated. On the other hand, the motives for so elaborate and bloodthirsty a falsehood are hard to explain. Yet Louis A. Barbé,⁵ who made a recent special study of the affair, declared the story to have been almost wholly a fabrication of the king's.⁶

JAMES VI BECOMES JAMES I OF ENGLAND

James had to assume the English crown before Episcopacy could really be restored. This crisis of his career was not long delayed. Already Elizabeth's death was being calculated on, and her courtiers from Cecil downwards were contending for the favour of her heir. She died on March 24th, 1603, and James was at once proclaimed her successor in accordance with her own declaration that no minor person should ascend her throne but her cousin, the king of Scots. Leaving Edinburgh on the 5th of April, James reached London on the 6th of May, being everywhere received with acclamation by the people.

Thus peacefully at a memorable epoch in the history of Europe was accomplished the union of south and north Britain. Often attempted in vain by conquest, it was now attained in a manner soothing the pride of the smaller country, without at first exciting the jealousy of the larger, whose interest was, as Henry VII prophesied, sure to predominate. To James it was a welcome change from nobles who had threatened his liberty and life, and from ministers who withstood his will and showed little respect for his person or office, to the courtier statesmen of England trained by the Tudors to reverence the monarch as all but absolute, and a clergy bound to recognise him as their head.

To Scotland, a poor country, and its inhabitants, poor also but enterprising and eager for new careers, it opened prospects of national prosperity which, though not at once, were ultimately realised. It was an immediate gain that border wars and English and French intrigues were at an end. This more than counterbalanced the loss of the court, a loss which probably favoured the independent development of the nation. For the present no change was made in its constitution, its church, or its laws. The Reformation had continued the work of the War of Independence. Scotland no longer consisted only of the prelates, the nobles, and the landed gentry. The commons, imperfectly represented in parliament by the burghs, not yet wealthy enough to be powerful, had found a voice in the assemblies of the church and leaders in its ministers and elders.

At this point in the treatment of some historians the history of Scotland ends. Juster views now prevail. Neither the union of crowns nor of parliaments really closes the separate record of a nation which retained separate laws, a separate church, a separate system of education, and a well-marked diversity of character. But a great part of the subsequent history of Scotland is necessarily included in that of Great Britain, and has been treated under

[1550-1617 A.D.]

England. Considerations of space and proportion make it necessary that what remains should be told even more rapidly than that narrative of what preceded the accession of James to the English throne.^o

CULTURE OF THE PERIOD; DRUMMOND AND NAPIER

In learning the nation had rather retrograded than advanced, owing to that struggle in defence of its beloved church by which its whole time and energies were fully occupied. The distinguished Scottish characters of this period were therefore men of action rather than contemplation; and they are to be found in the public arena where great events were at issue, rather than the closet or the college. From this general criterion, however, two illustrious exceptions occurred in the cases of Drummond of Hawthornden and Napier of Merchiston.


Sir William Drummond was born on the 13th of December, 1585. His family seat of Hawthornden, now a place of pilgrimage to admiring tourists, was a fitting birthplace and home for a poet; while his studies, which were chiefly devoted to the writings of the great authors of Greece and Rome, elevated his taste and refined his language beyond those of his contemporaries, not merely in Scotland but of England also. His sonnets, especially, were the admiration of the age on account of their purity of style and melody of versification, so that he has been justly compared to the best of his Italian models. His reputation as a poet, by the publication of several of his verses, and especially of *A Cypress Grove*, which was printed at Edinburgh in 1616, so widely diffused his poetical reputation that, only two or three years after, Ben Jonson resolved to pay a visit to their author; and this he accomplished in his own rough, bold fashion by a journey on foot of four hundred miles over moor and mountain, and among a people still dreaded as barbarians. The chief poetical works of Drummond were sonnets, madrigals, and religious poems, which during his lifetime were printed upon loose sheets and were not collected until 1650, six years after his death, when they were published in one volume.

The other distinguished Scot of this period—John Napier of Merchiston, inventor of the *logarithms*—has secured for himself a name as imperishable as the invention upon which it is founded. He was born in 1550, and although aggrandised with the title of baron, which in England was one of nobility, in Scotland it indicated nothing more than a laird, whose ancestors had held the power of *fossa et furca* within their own small domain. Little is known of the earlier part of his life, except that he studied in the university of St. Andrews and afterwards travelled on the Continent. On returning to Scotland his life was so studious and recluse, and his evening walks so lonely, that the country people eyed him at a distance and with fear, as a magician, or at least as something “not canny”; and to this he afforded some grounds by the nature of his studies, several of which bordered on the miraculous. The chief of these were the discovery of concealed treasures by the divining rod, and the invention of a warlike machine for the defence of Christendom that would destroy thirty thousand Turks by a single volley. The same love of the wonderful incited him to the study of the future, but in this he confined himself to the Revelations of St. John, upon which he published a *Commentary* in 1593. It was not, however, till 1614 that he burst upon the world in his true scientific character, by the publication of his *Book of Logarithms*; and in a short time this useful discovery, by which the most laborious and abstruse calculations were simplified into short, easy processes, was hailed

[1617 A.D.]

as one of the most valuable benefits that had ever been rendered to science. Still prosecuting these important investigations, he published in 1617 directions for the processes of multiplication and division by small graduated rods, which from their inventor were afterwards called "Napier's Bones." In the same year he died at Merchiston Castle.^h





CHAPTER XII

THE GRADUAL UNION WITH ENGLAND

[1603-1707 A.D.]

The admirers of Edward I of England seemed to suppose the most significant title they could place upon his tomb was *Malleus Scotorum*, "the hammer of the Scots." But, although it may be true that the hammer often breaks in pieces what may be opposed to it, this is not always so; and however unintentionally, the War of Independence proved to be the furnace, and Edward himself the hammer, by means of which the peoples inhabiting north Britain came to be welded together into solid iron, as the Scottish nation—the nation whose significant and appropriate mottoes have ever since been, *In Defence*; *Nemo me impune lacessit*. Hence there was produced one of the most remarkable nationalities perhaps ever witnessed: a nationality that not only asserted itself, during three hundred years of separation and antagonism, but has continued to survive and make itself felt after other three centuries of union with a people greater and more numerous, in spite of an absent court, government, and legislature, and all the provincialising influences thence arising.

—WILLIAM BURNS.^b

THE reign of James in England and his efforts to combine Scotland with it by a process of what has more recently been termed "benevolent assimilation," have been fully discussed in our history of England. The efforts to form a political coalescence were opposed by both races with all their inveterate aversion to each other. His religious problem was a triple one in that England was Episcopal, Ireland Catholic, and Scotland Presbyterian. By the parliament of 1612, however, James procured the revival of the act of 1592, which established Episcopacy in Scotland in spite of an opposing majority.

James visited Scotland but once (in 1617), after an absence of fourteen years. On this visit he procured the adoption of the English service by the Five Articles of Perth in 1618. The parliament of 1621 altered the mode of electing the lords of the articles, who monopolised the privilege of bringing in

bills, so that they were now completely under the influence of the bishops whom the king appointed. This step increased still further the dominance of the crown over the Scottish parliament, a progress towards despotism that came very curiously from so pusillanimous a creature as James. At his death, March 27th, 1625, the pleasantest memorial of his reign was the encouragement of colonisation, notably the "plantation" of the Hebrides by a body of gentlemen from Fife known as undertakers; and of Ulster in Ireland, by Scotch farmers whose posterity still preserves a Scottish dialect and the Presbyterian form of worship.

SCOTLAND UNDER CHARLES I; THE CIVIL WAR

The accession of James' son, Charles I, brought to the throne another monarch of towering pride and incommensurate strength. For years he held no parliament in Scotland, save for the formal adjournments of 1628 to 1633. Charles also continued to insist on the thrusting of Episcopacy down the Scottish throats. In 1633 he went in person to Scotland, taking with him the ill-advising and ill-fated Archbishop Laud.^a

In spite of the opposition of a convention of the estates, which nearly ended in bloodshed, the king carried out the resumption of tithes for the benefit of the clergy from their lay impropriators. The revocation in 1625 of all the grants in prejudice of the crown, whether before or after the act of annexation of 1587, was superseded by a new measure, ratified by parliament in 1633, declaring the terms on which the tithes might still be acquired and valued by the heritors. Few measures have been of greater importance in their bearing on Scottish history. The revocation alienated the nobles and landed gentry, who dreaded that when so much had been, still more might be, taken from their profits in the Reformation. The new valuation left the parochial clergy in the position of a poor class, with interests antagonistic to the gentry, whose income was diminished whenever the ministers attempted to raise their scanty stipends.

The loyalty for which the Scots had been distinguished had received a shock by the removal of the court, and this was a second and more serious blow. Yet when Charles came to Edinburgh and received the crown at Holyrood (June 18th, 1633) he was well received. The disaffection still lay beneath the surface. Although the Five Articles of Perth were not rigidly enforced, all the court could do was done to introduce the most obnoxious—the practice of kneeling at the communion, which Presbyterians deemed a relic of the mass.

The question of a liturgy was not allowed to rest. It was brought before the Scottish bishops in 1629; their draft was submitted to Laud, who detecting in it low-church doctrine as to baptism and traces of Knox's *Book of Common Order*, refused his approval and advocated the introduction of the English prayer-book, by which uniformity would be secured. Though this was not yet attempted, Charles took the same view as the zealous and ambitious churchman who was now his guide in ecclesiastical matters. Edinburgh was created a bishopric. The parliament over which Charles presided passed thirty-one acts, "not three of which," says a contemporary, but were most "hurtful to the liberty of the subject."

About a year after Charles left Scotland the trial of Lord Balmerino, which grew out of the acts of this parliament, gave the first impulse to the Scottish revolution. That nobleman, who had possessed a copy of a petition protesting against the acts then carried, was tried under the old acts against "leasing-

[1635-1641 A.D.]

making"¹ or sedition, and condemned by a majority of one upon a single charge—that of not revealing the petition and its author (March, 1635).

Although Charles respited the capital sentence, the condemnation deeply stirred the people, who saw almost the only mode of constitutional redress, that by petition, declared illegal and an act capable of innocent interpretation treated as a heinous crime. Before the trial the appointment of Spotswood as chancellor, the first ecclesiastic who held the office since the Reformation, and the admission of nine bishops to the privy council, increased the disaffection. In 1636 the *Book of Canons*, ratified by the king the year before, was published at Aberdeen, containing the most distinct assertion of the royal supremacy and a complete Episcopal organisation.

At last on Sunday, the 23rd of July, 1637, the much-dreaded liturgy, the use of which had been enjoined by the *Canons* and announced on the preceding Sunday, was introduced in the service of St. Giles cathedral, Edinburgh. For the most part a transcript of the English prayer-book, it deviated slightly in the direction of the Roman ritual.^a

The riotous scenes attending the effort to force this book on Scotland; the activity of Traquair, a member of the privy council; the organisation of the committees known as "the tables," from the table in the parliament house where they met; the writing and signing of the Covenant or "defence of the true religion as reformed from popery," on March 1, 1638, by the nobles, the clergy, and the multitude, amid scenes of immense excitement; the assembly of Glasgow which declined to be dissolved by the king's orders—all these happenings must be sought in our history of England.

The Glasgow assembly condemned the books of the *Canons* and the *Ordnances*; deposed the bishop on charges of immorality; asserted that Episcopacy had been finally abjured in 1580; and revived the Presbyterian form of ecclesiastical government. The appeal to arms and the success of the covenanters under their general, Alexander Leslie, led to the Pacification of Berwick, June 18th, 1639, by which church government was to be left to assemblies. The first of these was held August 1st, at Edinburgh, and a free parliament met August 20th to pass an act of oblivion, and abolish Episcopacy, restore the old mode of electing the lords of the articles, and diminish the absolutism of the crown. The indignant king adjourned the parliament without approving its acts. But his hands were so full of his own English parliament disputes that after hesitating over a proffered French alliance the Scots felt strong enough to act alone. Leslie led the covenanters into England and forced the truce of Ripon (September 2nd, 1640), by which a subsidy was to be paid the Scotch troops whom the English parliament permitted to hold the northern district.

Charles now, on Montrose's advice, decided to appease Scotland and visited Edinburgh in August, 1641, presiding over a parliament whose restoration of Presbyterianism and other reforms he ratified.^a

The lords of the articles were in future to be elected by each of the three estates separately, the burghs taking the place of the bishops; the court of high commission was abolished; arbitrary proclamations were prohibited; the officers of state and the judges were to be chosen with the advice of parliament; and, following an English bill, parliament was to meet every third year. During his stay in Scotland occurred "the incident"—still spoken of as mysterious by historians, some of whom liken it to the English inci-

[¹ Vaughan^c speaks of "that foul blot in the history of Scottish legislation—the law against 'leasing-making,' which exposed a man to the punishment of death if convicted of speaking disrespectfully concerning the king or the persons belonging to his government."]

A council of state, containing only two Scottish members, was appointed, but matters of importance were referred to Cromwell and his English council. The administration of justice was committed to four English and three Scottish judges in place of the court of sessions, with the view of introducing English law. In the church the Presbyterian form of service and the system of presbyteries and synods were allowed to continue, but the stipends of ministers depended on their being approved by a commission appointed by Cromwell. Free trade and an improved postal system between the two countries were established.

In all departments of government there was vigour and the spirit of reform, so that it was admitted even by opponents that the eight years of Cromwell's usurpation were a period of peace and prosperity.¹ There was undoubtedly one exception. The taxation was severe. A land-tax of £10,000 a month, afterwards reduced to £6,000, and levied upon the value rent under a valuation of Charles, far exceeded any subsidy before granted to the crown. Customs and also excise duties, recently introduced from England, were diligently levied; so also were the rents of the crown and bishops' land. Altogether it was estimated that a revenue of £143,000 was collected in Scotland. But this had to be supplemented by an equal sum from England to meet an expenditure of £286,000. As nearly the whole was spent in Scotland, and the burden of taxation fell on the upper classes, the nation generally did not feel it so much as might have been expected.

It was a maxim of Cromwell's policy to improve the condition of the commons, and in one of his last speeches he claimed in memorable words to have effected this in Scotland. In this respect the commonwealth and protectorate continued the political effect of the Reformation. The commonalty for the first time since the War of Independence acquired a consciousness of its existence and hope for the future. Cromwell, like former powerful rulers, aimed at uniting Scotland with England, but his proposals in this direction were premature.

To Barebones' Parliament (1653), which met after the dissolution of the Long Parliament, five Scottish members were summoned, there being one hundred and thirty-four from England, Wales, and Ireland. By the Instrument of Government and an ordinance following it, Scotland was granted thirty, while England had four hundred members; but only twenty Scottish attended the parliament of 1654, and care was taken by Monk that they should be men attached to Cromwell's interest. When in his second parliament in 1656 he tried the experiment of a house of lords, three Scotsmen were summoned, the quota of members to the commons remaining as before. This, like his other parliaments, was speedily dissolved.

On the death of the protector his son Richard was proclaimed his successor in Scotland as well as in England, and thirty members were again returned to the new parliament, which, however, was almost immediately afterwards dissolved. The Restoration soon followed, though in Scotland there was no need of it, for Charles II was already king. However beneficial the rule of Cromwell may be deemed, it had a fatal defect in the eyes of a people proud of their freedom. It was imposed and maintained by force. His death and the restoration of the ancient line of kings were looked on as a deliverance from oppression.

[¹ Burnet's words are famous: "There was good justice done, and vice was suppressed and punished; so that we always reckon those eight years of usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity." And there was a saying, "A man may ride all over Scotland with a switch in his hand and a hundred pounds in his pocket, which he could not have done these five hundred years."]

[1660-1661 A.D.]

THE RESTORATION; THE DRUNKEN PARLIAMENT

The hopes of the Scots from Charles II were doomed to speedy disappointment. So far from being grateful for the support they had given him in adversity, he looked back with disgust, as his grandfather had done, on the time when he was under the yoke of the Presbyterian ministers. Cromwell had shown the possibility of governing Scotland by military force and of raising a considerable revenue from it; and Charles took advantage of both lessons.

From this date rather than from the earlier or later union Scottish history assumes a provincial character; Scotland was governed without regard to its interest or wishes according to the royal pleasure or the advice of the nobles who for the time had the ear of the king. The power of the clergy had been broken by Cromwell's policy and their own divisions. The party of the Resolutioners or moderate Presbyterians, some of whom now leaned to Episcopacy, and the party of the Remonstrants were still irreconcilable, and their mutual hatred rendered the task of government easier. For the first two years after the Restoration the government of Scotland was in the hands of Middleton, who had been created an earl. The measures of retaliation were few but signal.⁴

The parliament which met at Edinburgh on the 1st of January, 1661, has been honoured with the name of "the drunken parliament." Burnet⁵ says: "It was a mad, roaring time, full of extravagance; and no wonder it was so, when the men of affairs were almost perpetually drunk." In England, the passions of the cavaliers were less fierce, and were held more in subjection by the obvious danger of provoking another civil war. In Scotland, the dominant party had no thought beyond that of keeping its opponents under its feet. Argyll, as the great leader of the covenanters, was now to offer the satisfaction of his head for the fall of his rival, Montrose. Upon the restoration of Charles, Argyll had hastened to London to offer his homage to the king. He was arrested, and then sent to Scotland, to be brought to trial for his alleged offences. When questioned before the parliament he pleaded the amnesty of 1651, and the English government determined to admit the plea. He was then accused of having received a grant from Cromwell, of having aided the English invaders, and of having sat in Richard Cromwell's parliament, and voted for a bill which abjured the rights of the Stuarts to the crown. The fate of Argyll was sealed when a packet arrived from England, containing letters from him to Monk, inimical to the king and favourable to Cromwell. To produce such private letters against an old associate in the same cause was as base in Monk as it was infamous in the parliament to be moved by such treachery to Argyll's condemnation. He was sentenced to be beheaded within forty-eight hours. He accepted the fate with courage and resignation. At the same time Guthrie, a Presbyterian minister, violent and uncompromising in his opinions, was put to death as an example to the clergy.⁶

Early in 1661 parliament passed the act of supremacy, by which the king was made supreme in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil; and the oath of allegiance, by which the denial of that supremacy was visited with the penalties of high treason. In this way all for which the nation had been contending for years was prostrated by a single stroke, and an ample ground prepared for the persecutions which afterwards ensued. But even this headlong career was not fast enough for Middleton's parliament, as it was usually called, which generally transacted business after a debauch, and while their heads were still reeling with intoxication; and, tired of abrogating, one by

A council of state, containing only two Scottish members, was appointed, but matters of importance were referred to Cromwell and his English council. The administration of justice was committed to four English and three Scottish judges in place of the court of sessions, with the view of introducing English law. In the church the Presbyterian form of service and the system of presbyteries and synods were allowed to continue, but the stipends of ministers depended on their being approved by a commission appointed by Cromwell. Free trade and an improved postal system between the two countries were established.

In all departments of government there was vigour and the spirit of reform, so that it was admitted even by opponents that the eight years of Cromwell's usurpation were a period of peace and prosperity.¹ There was undoubtedly one exception. The taxation was severe. A land-tax of £10,000 a month, afterwards reduced to £6,000, and levied upon the value rent under a valuation of Charles, far exceeded any subsidy before granted to the crown. Customs and also excise duties, recently introduced from England, were diligently levied; so also were the rents of the crown and bishops' land. Altogether it was estimated that a revenue of £143,000 was collected in Scotland. But this had to be supplemented by an equal sum from England to meet an expenditure of £286,000. As nearly the whole was spent in Scotland, and the burden of taxation fell on the upper classes, the nation generally did not feel it so much as might have been expected.

It was a maxim of Cromwell's policy to improve the condition of the commons, and in one of his last speeches he claimed in memorable words to have effected this in Scotland. In this respect the commonwealth and protectorate continued the political effect of the Reformation. The commonalty for the first time since the War of Independence acquired a consciousness of its existence and hope for the future. Cromwell, like former powerful rulers, aimed at uniting Scotland with England, but his proposals in this direction were premature.

To Barebones' Parliament (1653), which met after the dissolution of the Long Parliament, five Scottish members were summoned, there being one hundred and thirty-four from England, Wales, and Ireland. By the Instrument of Government and an ordinance following it, Scotland was granted thirty, while England had four hundred members; but only twenty Scottish attended the parliament of 1654, and care was taken by Monk that they should be men attached to Cromwell's interest. When in his second parliament in 1656 he tried the experiment of a house of lords, three Scotsmen were summoned, the quota of members to the commons remaining as before. This, like his other parliaments, was speedily dissolved.

On the death of the protector his son Richard was proclaimed his successor in Scotland as well as in England, and thirty members were again returned to the new parliament, which, however, was almost immediately afterwards dissolved. The Restoration soon followed, though in Scotland there was no need of it, for Charles II was already king. However beneficial the rule of Cromwell may be deemed, it had a fatal defect in the eyes of a people proud of their freedom. It was imposed and maintained by force. His death and the restoration of the ancient line of kings were looked on as a deliverance from oppression.

¹ Burnet's words are famous: "There was good justice done, and vice was suppressed and punished; so that we always reckon those eight years of usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity." And there was a saying, "A man may ride all over Scotland with a switch in his hand and a hundred pounds in his pocket, which he could not have done these five hundred years."

[1660-1661 A.D.]

THE RESTORATION; THE DRUNKEN PARLIAMENT

The hopes of the Scots from Charles II were doomed to speedy disappointment. So far from being grateful for the support they had given him in adversity, he looked back with disgust, as his grandfather had done, on the time when he was under the yoke of the Presbyterian ministers. Cromwell had shown the possibility of governing Scotland by military force and of raising a considerable revenue from it; and Charles took advantage of both lessons.

From this date rather than from the earlier or later union Scottish history assumes a provincial character; Scotland was governed without regard to its interest or wishes according to the royal pleasure or the advice of the nobles who for the time had the ear of the king. The power of the clergy had been broken by Cromwell's policy and their own divisions. The party of the Resolutioners or moderate Presbyterians, some of whom now leaned to Episcopacy, and the party of the Remonstrants were still irreconcilable, and their mutual hatred rendered the task of government easier. For the first two years after the Restoration the government of Scotland was in the hands of Middleton, who had been created an earl. The measures of retaliation were few but signal.⁴

The parliament which met at Edinburgh on the 1st of January, 1661, has been honoured with the name of "the drunken parliament." Burnet⁵ says: "It was a mad, roaring time, full of extravagance; and no wonder it was so, when the men of affairs were almost perpetually drunk." In England, the passions of the cavaliers were less fierce, and were held more in subjection by the obvious danger of provoking another civil war. In Scotland, the dominant party had no thought beyond that of keeping its opponents under its feet. Argyll, as the great leader of the covenanters, was now to offer the satisfaction of his head for the fall of his rival, Montrose. Upon the restoration of Charles, Argyll had hastened to London to offer his homage to the king. He was arrested, and then sent to Scotland, to be brought to trial for his alleged offences. When questioned before the parliament he pleaded the amnesty of 1651, and the English government determined to admit the plea. He was then accused of having received a grant from Cromwell, of having aided the English invaders, and of having sat in Richard Cromwell's parliament, and voted for a bill which abjured the rights of the Stuarts to the crown. The fate of Argyll was sealed when a packet arrived from England, containing letters from him to Monk, inimical to the king and favourable to Cromwell. To produce such private letters against an old associate in the same cause was as base in Monk as it was infamous in the parliament to be moved by such treachery to Argyll's condemnation. He was sentenced to be beheaded within forty-eight hours. He accepted the fate with courage and resignation. At the same time Guthrie, a Presbyterian minister, violent and uncompromising in his opinions, was put to death as an example to the clergy.⁷

Early in 1661 parliament passed the act of supremacy, by which the king was made supreme in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil; and the oath of allegiance, by which the denial of that supremacy was visited with the penalties of high treason. In this way all for which the nation had been contending for years was prostrated by a single stroke, and an ample ground prepared for the persecutions which afterwards ensued. But even this headlong career was not fast enough for Middleton's parliament, as it was usually called, which generally transacted business after a debauch, and while their heads were still reeling with intoxication; and, tired of abrogating, one by

one, the acts of former Scottish parliaments for the liberties of the church and the subject, they at last proceeded to sweep them away by wholesale. This was done by what was called the Rescissory Act, which decreed that all the proceedings devised and established for reformation, between the years 1638 and 1650, were rebellious and treasonable, including the Solemn League and Covenant itself, and the memorable Assembly of Glasgow in 1638, in which Episcopacy had been overthrown.

Resolutions so mad and so despotic were the inevitable precursors of martyrdom, for they could only be confirmed by shedding the best blood of the country. In August, 1661, a letter from the king was received by the Scottish council, in which Charles, after denouncing the national Presbyterian polity as inconsistent with a monarchic government, thus briefly announced his sovereign purpose: "Wherefore we declare our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring the Church of Scotland to its right government by bishops, as it was before the late troubles." When the apostate, James Sharp, had sold his brethren and his church to their enemies, and been guerdoned with the archbishopric of St. Andrews, which made him primate of Scotland, it was easy to guess the nature of this "right government by bishops" and whether it would be worthy of the name.⁹

THE NEW CLERGY AND THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE OLD

Sharp's example was followed by other ministers of the same party. But the majority and all the remonstrants stood firm; three hundred and fifty were deprived of their livings, each of which became a centre of disaffection towards the government, while their attachment to the Covenant was every day strengthened by persecution. The Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant were declared unlawful oaths, and all persons speaking or writing against the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical were incapacitated from office.

Middleton had the immediate responsibility for these measures, and the condemnation and forfeiture of the new earl of Argyll, whose estates he coveted, under the old law against leasing-making increased the hatred with which he was regarded. His fall was due to an attempt to supplant his rival Lauderdale by the Act of Billeting, under which the Scottish parliament named by ballot twelve persons with Lauderdale at their head as incapable of holding public office. This and other acts were carried out without the previous consent of Charles; Lauderdale persuaded Charles that his personal authority was in danger, and Middleton was called to court and sent as governor to Tangier, where he soon after died. The earl of Rothes was now appointed commissioner, but the chief influence was in the hands of Lauderdale, who continued to act as Scottish secretary in London.

The change in its rulers brought no relief to Scotland.^a To supply this unexpected and astounding blank with a new clergy, was now the difficulty of the bishops; and accordingly raw uneducated lads, and other characters still more unfit by their moral disqualifications, were thrust into the vacant charges. "They were the worst preachers I ever heard," is the candid confession of Burnet;^b "they were ignorant to a reproach, and many of them were openly vicious. They were a disgrace to their orders and the sacred function, and were, indeed, the dregs and refuse of the northern parts. Those of them who arose above contempt or scandal, were men of such violent tempers that they were as much hated as the others were despised."

In the mean time the dispossessed clergy became more formidable in their

[1664-1666 A.D.]

wanderings than they could have been in their peaceful homes. Their sincerity had been tested and proven; and everywhere among the people, by whom they were regarded as martyrs, they were certain to find willing and enthusiastic followers. Conventicles and field-meetings, therefore, became the order of the day; and in such a country as Scotland it was easy to find places for these proscribed assemblies which espionage could not easily discover, or armed violence approach with safety. Those almost inaccessible swamps and rock-girdled recesses, among which national liberty had found a shelter in the days of Wallace and Bruce, were now the meeting-places of those children of the Covenant, who could no longer enter a church without abjuring the principles for which they were ready to sacrifice their all.

To break up these conventicles was now the aim of the Scottish statesmen and bishops; and while troops of horse and foot were employed for the purpose, those wretched clergymen who had been thrust into the places of the ejected became the scouts and spies of the persecutors, and led them on to the place of onslaught. The land was laid under military execution; the soldiers were irresponsible judges, who tried and punished in their own savage fashion; and when their unfortunate victim was spared from death or torture, it was only that he might be beggared by fines or wasted by imprisonment.^a

THE TYRANNIES UNDER SHARP, BURNET, AND LAUDERDALE

In 1664, the parliament being dissolved, a Court of [High or] Ecclesiastical Commission moved from place to place over the country, diffusing terror wherever it came. Sharp, the evil genius of Scotland at this period, was the parent of this commission, which consisted of nine prelates and of a certain number of lay functionaries. Its principles of proceeding betrayed a contempt of law and justice to which it is not easy to find a parallel except in the history of the Inquisition. The slightest expression of the popular feeling was magnified into a formidable conspiracy against the church and state; the prisons were crowded with victims; the most ruinous penalties were imposed; and so useless was evidence or defence, that multitudes of innocent persons suffered themselves to be outlawed rather than fall into the hands of a tribunal which seemed to exist but for the purpose of giving full play to the worst passions of human nature. At length, the lay commissioners began to blush for the conduct of the ministers of religion, and by gradually withdrawing from the sittings of the court they put an end to its existence in the second year from its formation.

Unhappily the goading oppressions of the ecclesiastical commission court were succeeded by the less endurable tyranny of the soldiery. The military spread themselves over the west of Scotland, and were quartered everywhere upon the persons convicted of absenting themselves from their parish church. The exactions, the insolence, and the manifold oppressions which were thus sent home to the hearths of obnoxious persons were such as could not be long continued without producing insurrection, or completely crushing the party subject to them. The fines which Middleton had levied upon alleged delinquents a little before his removal from office were now exacted with the greatest rigour for the purpose of making additions to the military force; and to make room for the large class whose indigence left them exposed to no other form of punishment, multitudes who had been committed to prison by the late ecclesiastical commission were sent as convicts to Barbadoes.

When this course had been pursued between two and three years, a partial

insurrection broke out. It originated, as frequently happens in such cases, in local accident, and was marked to its close by an absence of the concert necessary to success. The numbers of the insurgents never exceeded two thousand, and the fears which their early successes diffused were allayed by their memorable defeat on the Pentland hills. Military tyranny was then followed by military executions. The bishops, particularly Sharp, and Burnet the archbishop of Glasgow, reproved the tardy humanity of their order, and of the military officers. Twenty of the prisoners taken at Pentland were executed at Edinburgh, and thirty-five before their own doors in other parts of the country. Many were put to the torture to discover the secrets of an enterprise which owed its origin to an accident falling like a spark on the prepared temper of the people. The court at length sent an order to put an end to these sanguinary proceedings; but Sharp and Burnet withheld the document until they had numbered McKail [or M'Kail], a young preacher of great reputation among the covenanters, with their victims.

McKail¹ was put to the torture; the instrument employed was the boot, which was of iron, and was made to crush the leg by means of wedges. The prisoner sustained the barbarous pressure until the bone was broken; and when led to the scaffold he exclaimed, with the enthusiasm which had often produced its powerful effect upon his followers, "Farewell, thou sun and moon! the world and all its delights, farewell! Welcome God my Father! welcome Christ my Redeemer, welcome glory and eternal life! welcome death!" The utterance of these sentiments, with the aid of a fine voice and much natural dignity of manner, is said to have called forth tears from all who heard them.

But even now the cup was not full. Dalziel and Drummond, in whom the chief military command was vested, exceeded in their severities those who had preceded them. They introduced military execution into the west, and in a temper to be expected from men who are described as of a brutal character, inured to cruelty in the service of Russia. In the words of Laing,^a "Some were put to the sword or executed on the highway without a trial; others were tortured with lighted matches fastened to their fingers, to extort confession; and among the atrocities imputed to Dalziel, a son was executed because he refused to discover his father; a woman accessory to the escape of her husband was tortured to death.

The soldiers were indulged in every species of excess. Rapes, robberies, and murders were committed with impunity, and the prisoners arrested on suspicion were stripped and thrust into crowded, contracted, and unwholesome gaols. Instead of penalties, a sufficient number of soldiers were quartered on recusants to ruin or eat them up in a single night. The clergy, instead of interceding for the people, abetted the crimes of the military, with whom they associated, aided or directed their violence, connived at their escapes, and amidst calamities productive of a transient conformity, rejoiced at the golden age which the church enjoyed. The western counties were subject for seven months to every species of military outrage, till the appearance of the Dutch fleet in the Forth recalled the troops to the protection of the coast."

While the conduct of the military and of the clergy was characterised by so much tyranny and cruelty, it will not be supposed that the courts of justice were kept pure. It was one of the most ancient and unquestionable provisions of the law of Scotland that no party should be condemned in his absence, or

[¹ M'Kail was the first martyr of the Covenant as Wishart had been of the Reformation. — MACKAY, ^d]

[1667-1673 A.D.]

be deprived by outlawry of a legal trial on his appearance in court. But that the property of the more opulent delinquents, who had many of them escaped the hands of their persecutors, might be seized, the officers of state prevailed upon the judges to declare that the judiciary court might proceed to try and condemn all traitorous persons who refused to make their appearance. In this manner one of the most valuable securities of Scottish law was abolished, and by this means the estates of fifty-five gentlemen passed into the hands of Dalziel and Drummond, and of the members of the administration, the sufferers being sentenced to be executed whenever they should be apprehended.

In order that the power of the government might be augmented at pleasure and made to embrace, as occasion might demand, almost any extent of severity, it was agreed that the statute imposing the oath of supremacy, and requiring an abjuration of the Covenant, should not include any specified penalty, but that in this case, as in some others of no less importance, the form and measure of punishment should be left to the discretion of the ministers of the crown. The effect of this arbitrary policy was to expose offenders to the fear of every sort of oppression. The punishment usually inflicted in such cases was servitude in the West Indian plantations, which generally proved a lingering death.

After the fall of Clarendon, and the disastrous issue of the Dutch war, the government of Scotland became much less intolerant, and in civil affairs was conducted with much more equity and wisdom. The two archbishops, Sharp and Burnet, were dismissed to their episcopal duties, and commanded to abstain from meddling with state matters.

This milder administration lasted about three years. But towards the close of 1669 the government began to resume much of its former temper. Lauderdale became the husband of the countess of Dysart, a most dangerous woman, who acquired a complete ascendancy over him. Lauderdale, after much effort, had succeeded in obtaining a place in the cabal administration; and in the hope of commending himself effectually to the favour of the king and of his advisers, he procured the passing of two acts in the Scottish parliament which promised to place the affairs both of church and state in that kingdom more than ever at the disposal of the crown.

The first of these acts declared the external government of the church to be an inherent right of the crown, and gave to the decisions of the sovereign concerning all ecclesiastical matters, meetings, and persons, when recorded and published by the privy council, the force of laws. This was at the moment when the secret treaty with France, designed to overthrow the Protestant religion in Great Britain, was in progress, and when the expectation of its success was the most sanguine. With this first act was a second, which established an army of twenty-two thousand men in Scotland, empowered to march under the direction of the privy council of that kingdom to any part of the British dominions, as the honour or safety of the king might require.

At the same time the laws against conventicles, particularly against those held in the fields, and which were become the most common, were rendered more severe. The penalties incurred by a field preacher were confiscation and death; his hearers, if apprehended, were subject to double fines, and punished as convicted of sedition; and fines, imprisonment, and transportation were rigorously inflicted on those who refused to furnish information upon oath against their relations and friends. It should be remembered that the Presbyterians, towards whom all this severity was exercised, were at least three-fourths of the nation. The effect, as might have been expected, was to convert the field meetings into armed assemblies.

[1672-1673 A.D.]

Lauderdale became a duke; his profusion had scarcely any limit; his duchess rendered everything venal; and his government, after having been characterised for some time by a comparative equity and mildness, became in all respects the most insolent and tyrannical that Scotland had ever witnessed. The nobility who did not much exceed a hundred in number were mostly poor, and too generally obsequious in all things to those who happened to enjoy the royal favour. The courts of justice were so corrupt as to have no sort of hold on the esteem or confidence of the people; while the members of the privy council were known to be the mere creatures of the minister. His rapacity and that of the men who in various capacities acted with him appeared to have no end. His salary was 16,000*l.*; he received in donations nearly double that amount, beside large sums from other sources, especially from the feudal claims of the crown in matters of wardship and marriage, and in the shape of fines imposed on religious grounds.

In the latter form Athol, the justice-general, exacted nearly two thousand pounds in one week. The wife of a gentleman had attended a field-meeting, and a youth from school had accompanied her, and both were obliged to compound for 1,500*l.* Ten gentlemen in the shire of Renfrew, and these not the most considerable persons of their class, were amerced to the amount of 30,000*l.* These fines, in fact, were farmed like any other source of revenue; and Lauderdale often insulted the sufferers with his unfeeling jests while in the act of plundering them. In the meanwhile the commerce of the country suffered greatly, in part from certain of the duties laid upon imports and exports, and in part from a number of monopolies introduced for the benefit of the minister and his friends.

Encouraged by the strong feeling of disaffection to the government both in England and Scotland, the Scottish parliament in 1673, to the great surprise and indignation of Lauderdale, demanded that a redress of the national grievances should precede the granting of a supply. Lauderdale resorted to the usual means of intimidation. But the body of the nobility and gentry now arrayed against him, led by the duke of Hamilton, and strengthened by the deep feeling of the people, proved too formidable to be subdued by such expedients. Lauderdale adjourned the parliament for two months, and the leaders of the discontented nobles were invited to court, where they were assured by the king that the matters of which they complained were left to be dealt with as should appear best to the parliament.

It was now the depth of winter, and the severity of the season had destroyed a third of the sheep and cattle; but Hamilton and his colleague, the earl of Tweeddale, hastened back with their welcome tidings to Edinburgh. Soon after their arrival the deception which had been practised upon them became manifest. The parliament was assembled, but only to be immediately adjourned and afterwards dissolved by letters from the king. This proceeding excited great indignation. Hamilton and Tweeddale prayed to be again heard by the king; and Charles replied that he was willing to receive any communication from the dissatisfied in writing; but so comprehensive were the tyrannical provisions of the Scotch law of leasing-making, and so strong was the conviction of Hamilton and his friends that the government was disposed to put those provisions into the fullest requisition against them, that no man could venture to attach his name to any written statement of the public grievances.¹ In the end the misguided monarch succeeded not

¹The king could not wholly justify the acts of his minister. "But," says Burnet, "when May, the master of the privy purse, asked him in his familiar way what he thought now of his Lauderdale, he answered, as May himself told me, that they had objected many

[1674-1677 A.D.]

only in confirming the duke in his offices, but in removing Hamilton and some other opponents of the obnoxious minister from their places in the council.

The oppressions of the past were in consequence renewed, and in some respects exceeded. The people of Edinburgh were a special object of jealousy. The city was denied the right of electing its own magistrates, and placed in the hands of one Ramsay (a tool of the duke's) as provost. Nobles and gentlemen known as the opponents of the minister, were driven from their homes one after another, and their residences converted at pleasure into garrisons for the suppression of conventicles. Persons suspected of disaffection found themselves exposed to fines or imprisonment on the most trivial and unjust pretences, and no form of perjury was too base to be admitted as the means of convicting such parties.

LETTERS OF INTERCOMMUNING (1675 A.D.)

In the train of these occurrences followed the practice of issuing forms of prosecution known but too well through Scotland in that age under the name of "letters of intercommuning," 1675, by which accused parties, failing to make their appearance when summoned, were declared outlaws; and all persons who should minister relief to them, or hold any sort of intercourse with them, were made to be partakers of their offences. It is calculated that at this time there were not less than seventeen thousand persons whose attendance at conventicles or absence from church had brought the evils of persecution upon them in forms more or less oppressive.

These letters, after the example of the *Aquæ et ignis interdictis* of the Roman law, concluded thus: "We command and charge all our lieges and subjects that none presume to receive, supply, or intercommune with any of the aforesaid our rebels, nor furnish them with meat, drink, house, harbour, or victuals, nor any other thing useful or comfortable to them; nor have intelligence with them by word, writing, message, or otherwise, under the pain of being reputed and esteemed act and part with them in the crime aforesaid, and to be pursued therefore with all rigour." [They have also been compared to the boycott.]

That the fervid temper of the Scottish people might be goaded to the utmost, documents were issued by the government, under the title of "bonds of peace," which required landlords to become responsible, not merely for their own families but for those of their tenants, and made them accountable to the magistrate even for the servants, whether belonging to their own households or to those of persons renting their property, who should be convicted of holding intercourse with intercommuned persons, of attending conventicles, or of absenting themselves from the services of their parish church. This monstrous stretch of tyranny was not to be submitted to, and the parties concerned not only refused to place themselves under the yoke prepared for them, but, while professing to lament the manifest increase of conventicles, ventured to suggest that, so long as the persons frequenting such assemblies continued to meet and separate peaceably, the best method of dealing with the alleged evil would probably be to leave it to its course.

damned things that he had done against them, but there was nothing objected that was against his service: such are the notions that many kings drink in, by which they set up an interest for themselves, in opposition to the interest of the people." Hume terms the opinion of the king "a sentiment unworthy of a sovereign." It was a sentiment worthy of a captain of banditti.—KNIGHT.]

[1678 A.D.]

This display of patriotic firmness and of political wisdom was interpreted as an act of rebellion. The west of Scotland, though without the slightest appearance of disorder, was declared to be in a state of open revolt; and at the command of the king a large body of English soldiers marched upon the devoted country; forces from Ireland landed at the same time on different points, and an army of six thousand Highlanders spread themselves, in the temper of rude banditti, over the fairest portion of the kingdom. Those who still refused to enter into the proposed "bonds" were everywhere plundered and insulted. All men saw that the object of the government was to goad them into acts of violence,¹ in order that their chains might be fastened upon them with some show of justice, and every one seemed to task his powers of endurance to the utmost in the hope of defeating this pitiless device of the oppressor. Not only were these wrongs inflicted; all complaint under them was prohibited.

It was in violation of this prohibition that a body of the Scottish nobility and gentry repaired to the court of England, resolved that the condition of their bleeding country should be known in that quarter. In the mean while the popular party in England spoke of the measures adopted in Scotland as those which, if unchecked, would of course be meted out in due time to England. At length the complaints from Scotland, strengthened by more alarming appearances in England, so far prevailed that Charles issued orders for the recall of the English and Irish regiments; the Highlanders returned, laden with spoil, to their native hills, and the recent measures were suspended.

The nobles and gentlemen from Scotland having laid their complaints before the king, Danby and the duke of York laboured to defend the conduct of Lauderdale. In conclusion, the nobles were required to state their grievances in writing. This they professed themselves willing to do, but prayed for a promise of indemnity against the law of leasing-making should their language admit of being interpreted as containing matter of accusation against any member of his majesty's privy council. This reasonable demand was not complied with, and the refusal sufficed to make these injured persons fully sensible of the snare which had been laid for them. Their declining in these circumstances to sign a statement of their grievances was set forth by the king as evidence that their matters of complaint were too trivial to admit of their being committed to writing; and in a letter dated the next day, Charles expressed his unqualified approval of all that had been done by Lauderdale and his coadjutors.

In the mean while the duke, availing himself of the absence of his opponents from Scotland, assembled a parliament in Edinburgh, which by dint of treachery, threatenings, and bribes, proved subservient in all respects to his wishes. Five thousand additional troops were quartered on the people. In the west and south the soldiery converted private houses into garrisons, or roamed at large in search of conventicles, committing violence of every description with impunity. New functionaries of the most arbitrary temper were appointed to secure a more rigorous enforcement of the laws, and were stimulated in the exercise of their authority by the promise of half the amount exacted as fines. Thus, in the affairs of Scotland at that time, as in all similar proceedings, each step in the progress of tyranny increased the resentment of its victims.

[¹ It appears to have been the design of Lauderdale, who still governed Scotland absolutely through the privy council (no parliament having been summoned since 1674), to force the Scots to rebel. "When I was once saying to him," relates Burnet, "Was that a time to drive them into a rebellion?" "Yes," said he, "would to God they would rebel that he might bring over an army of Irish papists to cut their throats."]

[1679 A.D.]

THE MURDER OF ARCHBISHOP SHARP

This succession of measures had produced their natural effect, irritating the people almost to madness, when a memorable act of violence occurred which placed the oppressors and the oppressed more than ever at issue. It has appeared that Sharp, who deserted his Presbyterian brethren at the restoration and who was afterwards raised to the archbishopric of St. Andrews, became chargeable from the time of his apostasy with innumerable acts of perfidy and cruelty towards his former friends. He had done more than any other man towards rendering his country one of the most injured and unhappy in the history of modern Europe.

It happened at this juncture that one Carmichael, a commissioner of the archbishop's, had made himself exceedingly odious among the people of Fife by his cruelties towards them on the charge of frequenting conventicles. Women, children, and servants, it is said, were put to the torture by his orders, that they might be compelled to make known the concealment of their husbands, parents, and masters. Nine intercommuned persons, whose apprehension was sought by such means, met in their place of secrecy and resolved to avenge themselves on Carmichael by seizing his person, and possibly putting him to death. Search was made for him near Magus Muir, a few miles distant from St. Andrews, but in vain; and the fugitives were in the act of separating when information reached them that the archbishop himself was approaching.

By these injured and misguided men the coming of the prelate at such a moment was interpreted as a call from heaven to execute judgment on the great delinquent, in the place of the commissioner. For this purpose they commenced their attack upon the chariot in the most desolate part of the moor. Several shots were fired into it without effect. They then forced open the door, and dragged the object of their resentment forth from the arms of his daughter to the ground. They reminded their trembling victim of the falsehood, perjury, and blood to be laid to his account; and declaring they had no private ends to be answered by his death, but those of public justice only, they plunged their weapons into his body, heedless of the screams and entreaties of his daughter, and left him a corpse in the highway. No person, we presume, will attempt to justify this deed. Its effect on posterity has been to awaken sympathy in favour of a man who would otherwise have been regarded by every just and humane mind with an almost unmixed feeling of disgust.^c

THE INSURRECTION OF 1679; THE TEST ACT AND THE "KILLING TIME" OF 1681

This severity provoked a rising in the west. A small party led by Hamilton—a youth educated by Bishop Burnet at Glasgow, who had joined the covenanters—burned at Rutherglen the statutes and acts of privy council on the anniversary of the restoration, and being allowed to gather numbers defeated Graham of Claverhouse at Loudon Hill (the 1st of June). The duke of Monmouth, the favourite natural son of Charles, sent with troops from England to suppress the rising, gained an easy victory at Bothwell Bridge (the 22nd of June). His desire was to follow it up by a policy of clemency, and a new indulgence was issued, but its effect was counteracted by Lauderdale. All officers, ministers, and landowners, as well as those who had taken part in the rising and did not surrender within a short space, were excepted

[1679-1684 A.D.]

from the indulgence. Several preachers were executed, and many persons sent to the colonies, while fines and forfeitures multiplied.

A new and fiercer phase of the rebellion¹ was originated by Cargill and Cameron, two preachers who escaped at Bothwell Bridge, and assembling their followers at Sanquhar, published a declaration renouncing allegiance to Charles as a perjured king. They were soon surprised and Cameron was killed, but Cargill continued to animate his followers—called the “Society men,” or Cameronians—by his preaching, and at a conventicle at Torwood in Ayrshire excommunicated the king, the duke of York, Lauderdale, and Rothes.

James, the duke of York, who had become a Roman Catholic during his residence abroad, was now sent to Scotland, partly to avoid the discussion raised by his conversion as to his exclusion from the succession. During a short stay of three months he astonished the Scots by the mildness of his administration, but on his return in the following year he revealed his true character. The privy council renewed its proclamations against conventicles and increased the fines, which were levied by the sheriff or other magistrate under the pain of liability if they were remiss in their exaction. Military commissions were issued to Claverhouse and other officers in the southern and western shires empowering them to quarter their troops on recusants and administer martial law. Torture was freely resorted to by the privy council, and the duke himself took pleasure in witnessing it. A parliament summoned in 1681, after passing a general act against popery to lull suspicion, proceeded to declare the succession to be in the ordinary line of blood and unalterable on account of difference of religion by any future law.

The Test Act was then carried, not without many attempts to modify it. Its ambiguous and contradictory clauses made it an admirable instrument of tyranny, a shelter for the lax and a terror to the upright conscience. [It was said to compel its signer to be at the same time Catholic, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian.] It was at once enforced, and Argyll, who declared he took it only so far as it was consistent with itself and the Protestant religion, was tried and condemned to death for treason, but escaped from prison [disguised as a page, holding up his step-daughter's train] and reached Holland. Dalrymple, the president of the court of session, and many leading Presbyterian ministers and gentry followed his example, and found a hospitable refuge in the republic which first acknowledged toleration in religion. They there met a similar band of English exiles. The next two years were spent in plots, of which the centre was in Holland, with branches in London and Edinburgh.

The failure of the Rye House Plot in 1683 led to the execution of Russell and Sidney and the arrest of Spence, a retainer of Argyll, Carstares, Baillie of Jerviswood, and Campbell of Cessnock. Against Campbell the proof of complicity failed, and Spence and Carstares, though cruelly tortured, revealed nothing of moment. Baillie, however, was condemned and executed upon slender proof. The Cameronians, who kept alive in remote districts the spirit of rebellion, were treated with ruthless cruelty. Although doubt has been cast on the death of Brown the carrier, shot down in cold blood by Claverhouse, and the Wigtown martyrs, two poor women tied to a stake and drowned in the Bay of Luce, the account of Wodrow² has, after a keen discussion, been sustained as accurate. The conduct of the government in Scotland gained for this period the name of the “killing times.”³

[¹ Hume Brown calls the period that follows “the blackest and most impressive page in the national history.”]

[1681-1684 A.D.]

WHOLESALE PERSECUTION, INQUISITION, AND TORTURE (1681-1685 A.D.)

Even in the fiercest explosion of covenanting resistance there was, strictly speaking, no disloyalty of purpose in the oppressed—no thought of disturbing monarchy, or displacing the king. All they sought was liberty to assemble and worship God undisturbed, whether in peaceful huts or upon the lonely hillside, while they abhorred the charge of rebellion. These sentiments were distinctly expressed, in their last moments, by Kid and King, two Presbyterian ministers, who had been dragged as prisoners by Claverhouse to Drumclog, where they were released by the victors, and who had been led against their will to Bothwell Bridge, from which, after exhorting their countrymen, but in vain, to return to their peaceful obedience and non-resistance, they had taken the opportunity of escaping before the battle commenced. And yet, after being tortured with the boots, they were brought to the scaffold as rebels and leaders of the insurgents.

During these years of trial and calamity, in which no age, or sex, or condition was spared, the long roll of the persecutors, and the variety and fiendishness of its items, could only be paralleled by that of the duke of Alva in the Netherlands. The heart sickens over it and the eye turns away with disgust; but out of the list we may select only one instance, and that by no means the most revolting. During this period it happened that Gilbert Wilson, a farmer in Wigtonshire, with his wife, had conformed to Prelacy, while his two daughters, Margaret and Agnes, the former eighteen and the other only thirteen years old, adhered to the oppressed Presbyterians. For this such helpless girls were chased as if they had been armed men, and were obliged to seek shelter among the bleak mountains and morasses until they were apprehended. On this the father hastened to Edinburgh, and by the payment of a heavy sum obtained the life of Agnes, his little one.

But no mercy was to be extended to Margaret; she was sentenced to die (in 1684), and that, too, in the old Scottish mode of drowning reserved for female malefactors, by being bound to a stake planted in the sea within flood-mark, near her native Wigton. To another stake was bound [Margaret Lauchleson] an old woman, aged sixty-three, also one of these dreaded overturners of kings and governments. At the place of execution Margaret Wilson was urged by her relations to save her life by taking the oath of implicit allegiance, and promising to attend the ministrations of the curate; but she had come to die, not to apostatise, and their entreaties were in vain.

The tide advanced, and the old woman, who was nearest the sea, was struggling and smothering amidst the waves. "Margaret, what do you think of your friend now?" cried some, either in scorn or hoping that she would yet relent; but the intrepid girl, still undaunted at the fate which so soon would be her own, replied, "What do I see but Christ in one of his members wrestling there? Think you that we are the sufferers? No; it is Christ in us, for he sends none on a warfare upon their own charges." She engaged in prayer, and the water rose and covered her; but after a short space they lifted her up, and when she had recovered sensation and speech, Major Windram, who superintended the execution, asked her if she would pray for the king. "I wish," she replied, "for the salvation of all men, and the damnation of none."

"Dear Margaret," cried one of the bystanders, "say, God save the king." She answered calmly, "God save him, if he will, for it is his salvation I desire." "Sir, she has said it, she has said it!" shouted the crowd, who expected that she would be forthwith released.

[1684-1688 A.D.]

But this was not enough for Windram; and he required her instantly to swear the abjuration oath, otherwise she must endure her doom. But though thus cruelly tantalised with hope after she had tasted the bitterness of death, the brave young martyr rejected the proffer by which she must have renounced her brethren and condemned their cause. "I will not," she firmly replied; "I am one of Christ's children; let me go!" and at the word she was again thrust into the water and drowned.¹

In these persecutions, which extended over a long term of twenty-eight years, it is supposed that not less than eighteen thousand persons died by regular execution or military violence, by tortures or privations—a fearful amount of the best and bravest, in a country whose population scarcely amounted to one million souls.

THE ACCESSION OF JAMES VII (1685 A.D.)

With the accession of James VII (February 2nd, 1685) the darkest hour had arrived; but it was the hour that precedes the dawn. The conflict was no longer to be that of Prelacy against Presbyterianism, but of both, united into one common Protestantism, against a cause that was equally the enemy of both. The blundering and headlong career of the new king to restore Great Britain to the see of Rome was enough to excite in Scotland, as well as England, universal distrust and a spirit of general resistance. One of these egregious errors was his attempt to ingratiate himself with dissenters of every class opposed to the English church, by exempting them from previous penalties and disabilities, in which the Catholics were to be included.

By these acts of indulgence, published in 1687, in which every restriction was successively taken off, except that against field-meetings, the Presbyterians of both kingdoms were enabled to assemble without hindrance and worship without interruption. But a permission so dangerous to England, from the number of the Catholics who shared in the benefits of this new toleration, was a serious hurt to the royal cause in Scotland, where Catholicism was at so low an ebb, and where the whole nation was Presbyterian. When the rising accordingly commenced for the expulsion of James, there was a singleness of purpose on the subject among the Scots and a promptness of decision, which was scarcely found in England.

In the mean time the upholders of Scottish prelacy felt that their hour had expired, and were anxious to make their escape. But before they abdicated their ill-held offices, they made haste to obliterate the foul traces of their cruelty and mismanagement. Accordingly, the jails were emptied of those imprisoned covenanters who were still in durance, the pending sentences that waited for execution were rescinded or thrown aside, and the heads and mangled limbs that for years had been exposed upon the gates and market-crosses were hastily removed. As for those parish incumbents who had held office under the bishops, and who, in many cases, had acted as spies upon their flocks, they were, to the number of about three hundred, ejected from their livings by the now triumphant populace; but without bloodshed or loss of life, and with comparatively little personal violence. It was a marked contrast to their own conduct in the day of their prosperity.

In this way fell that unnational fabric of Scottish Episcopacy which James VI, Charles I, Charles II, and James VII, had spent more than a century in rearing. Scotland was to remain, as she had been from the first, a Presbyterian country.²

[¹ The aspersions cast on the truth of this incident have been fully silenced by the proofs of the Rev. Archibald Stewart.]

[1685-1688 A. D.]

The short reign of James VII is the saddest period in the history of Scotland. He succeeded in the brief space of three years in fanning the revolutionary elements in both England and Scotland into a flame which he was powerless to quench. He declined to take the Scottish coronation oath, which contained a declaration in favour of the church then established. A submissive parliament held (the 28th of April, 1685) under the duke of Queensberry as commissioner not only overlooked this, but expressed its loyalty in terms acknowledging the king's absolute supremacy. The excise was granted to the crown for ever, and the land tax to James for life. The law against conventicles was even extended to those held in houses, if five persons besides the family attended domestic worship; while, if the meeting was outside the house, at the door or windows, it was to be deemed a field conventicle, punishable by death. The class of persons subject to the test was enlarged.

Undeterred or provoked by these terrors of the law, Argyll made a descent upon the western Highlands and tried to raise his clansmen, but being badly supported by the officers under him, his troops were dispersed and he himself taken prisoner, when he was brought to Edinburgh, condemned and executed under his former sentence. [When he was taken to the rude sort of guillotine, called the "maiden," he said that it was "the sweetest maiden he had ever kissed."] Next year, Perth the lord chancellor, Melfort his brother, and the earl of Moray became converts to the papal faith. The duke of Queensberry, who did not follow their example, was enabled only by the most servile submission in other points to the royal wishes to save himself and his party in the privy council from dismissal. James sent a letter to parliament offering free trade with England and an indemnity for political offences, in return for which it was required that the Catholics should be released from the test and the penal laws.

But the estates refused to be bribed. Even the lords of the articles declined to propose a repeal of the Test Act. The burghs almost for the first time in a Scottish parliament showed their independence. The refractory parliament was at once adjourned and soon after dissolved, and James had recourse in Scotland as in England to the dispensing power. Under a pretended prerogative he issued a proclamation through the privy council, granting a full indulgence to the Romanists, and by another deprived the burghs of the right of electing magistrates. A more limited toleration was granted to Quakers and Presbyterians, by which they were allowed to worship according to their consciences in private houses. This was followed by a second and a third indulgence, which at last gave full liberty of worship to the Presbyterians and was accepted by most of their ministers; but the laws against field conventicles continued to be enforced. In February, 1688, Renwick was executed under them at Edinburgh. A band of his followers, including women and children, were marched north and imprisoned with great cruelty in Dunnottar. [A hundred men and women were placed in a vault ankle-deep in mire, with no room to sit or lie, and only one small opening for air. Ten who managed to escape were caught and kept for three hours with burning matches between their fingers.]

THE REVOLUTION OF 1688

Meantime the rapid series of events which led to the Revolution in England had reached its climax in the trial and acquittal of the seven bishops. William of Orange, who had long watched the progress of his father-in-law's

[1688-1689 A.D.]

tyranny, saw that the moment had come when almost all classes in England as well as Scotland would welcome him as a deliverer. But the Revolution was differently received in each part of the united kingdom. In England there was practically no opposition; in Catholic Ireland it was established by force. Scotland was divided. The Catholics, chiefly in the Highlands, and the Episcopalians led by their bishops adhered to James and formed the jacobite party, which kept up for half a century a struggle for the principle of legitimacy. The Presbyterians—probably the most numerous, certainly the most powerful party, especially in the Lowlands and burghs—supported the new settlement, which for the first time gave Scotland a constitutional or limited monarchy.

Shortly before his flight James had summoned his Scottish troops to England; but Douglas, brother of the duke of Queensberry, their commander-in-chief, went over to William. Claverhouse, now Viscount Dundee, the second in command, who had the spirit of his kinsman Montrose, after in vain urging James to fight for his crown, returned to Scotland, followed by some thirty horsemen. In Edinburgh the duke of Gordon still held the castle for James, while the convention parliament, presided over by the duke of Hamilton, was debating on what terms the crown should be offered to William.

Dundee passed through Edinburgh unmolested, and encouraged Gordon to hold out, while he himself gathered the Highland chiefs round his standard at Lochaber. Mackay, a favourite general of William, sent to oppose him, was defeated at Killiecrankie (the 27th of July, 1689), where the spirited leadership of Dundee and the dash of the Highlanders' attack gained the day; but success was turned into defeat by a bullet which killed Dundee almost at the moment of victory. No successor appeared to take his place and keep the chiefs of the clans together. The Cameronians, organised into a regiment under Cleland, repulsed Cannon, the commander of the Highland army, at Dunkeld, and the success of Livingston, who defeated the remnant under Cameron and Buchan at the Haughs of Cromdale on the Spey, ended the short and desultory war. The castle of Edinburgh had been surrendered a month before the battle of Killiecrankie. Three forts—Fort William, Fort Augustus, and Inverness—sufficed to keep the Highlands from rising for the next two reigns.

THE ACCESSION OF WILLIAM AND MARY; THE CONVENTION PARLIAMENT

Meantime the convention parliament in Edinburgh had carried the necessary measures for the transfer of the government of Scotland to William and Mary. It declared in bolder terms than the English parliament that James had forfeited the crown and that the throne was vacant. The fifteen articles which contained the reasons for this resolution were included in a Declaration and Claim of Right—a parallel to the English Declaration and Bill of Rights. Besides the declarations against the papists with which it commenced—that no papist could be king or queen, that proclamations allowing mass to

[¹ Dalrymple^m says, that when Dundee galloped through the city, "being asked by one of his friends who stopped him, 'where he was going,' he waved his hat, and is reported to have answered, 'wherever the spirit of Montrose shall direct me.'" Or as Scott says in the *Deeds of Devoorgill*:

"The Gordon demands of him which way he goes—
Where'er shall direct me the shade of Montrose—
Your grace in short space shall hear tidings of me,
Or that low lies the bonnet of bonny Dundee."]

[1689-1690 A.D.]

be said, Jesuit schools and colleges to be erected, and popish books to be printed were contrary to law—it detailed each of the unconstitutional acts of James and pronounced it contrary to law.

Commissioners were despatched to London to present the declaration and statement of grievances and take the royal oath to the acceptance of the crown on their terms. This was done at Whitehall in the following March (1689); but William, before taking the oath, required an assurance that persecution for religious opinion was not intended, and made a declaration in favour of toleration.

The parliament of 1690 abolished the committee of the articles, which had become an abuse inconsistent with the freedom of parliament, and, while it retained a committee on motions and overtures in its place, declared that the estates might deal with any matter without referring it to this committee. The Act of Supremacy was rescinded. The Presbyterian ministers deposed since 1661 were restored, and the Westminster Confession approved, though not imposed as a test except on professors. With more difficulty a solution was found for the question of church government. The Presbyterian church was re-established with the Confession as its formula, and patronage was placed in the heritors and elders with a small compensation to the patrons. These prudent measures were due to the influence of Carstairs, the chief adviser of William in Scottish ecclesiastical matters. He was not so well advised in the conduct of the civil government by the master of Stair, who became sole secretary for Scotland. The proclamation for calling out the militia may have been a necessary precaution, but it raised much opposition amongst the landed gentry, and the militia was not then embodied.⁴

HALLAM ON THE DOWNFALL OF EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND

The main controversy between the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches was one of historical inquiry, not perhaps capable of decisive solution; it was at least one as to which the bulk of mankind are absolutely incapable of forming a rational judgment for themselves. But mingled up as it had always been, and most of all in Scotland, with faction, with revolution, with power and emolument, with courage and devotion, with fear and hate, and revenge, this dispute drew along with it the most glowing emotions of the heart, and the question became utterly out of the province of argument. It was very possible that Episcopacy might be of apostolical institution; but for this institution houses had been burned and fields laid waste, and the gospel had been preached in wildernesses, and its ministers had been shot in their prayers, and husbands had been murdered before their wives, and virgins had been defiled, and many had died by the executioner, and by massacre, and in imprisonment, and in exile and slavery, and women had been tied to stakes on the seashore till the tide rose to overflow them, and some had been tortured and mutilated: it was a religion of the boots and the thumb-screw, which a good man must be very cool-blooded indeed if he did not hate and reject from the hands which offered it. For, after all, it is much more certain that the Supreme Being abhors cruelty and persecution, than that he has set up bishops to have a superiority over presbyters.

It was, however, a serious problem at that time whether the Presbyterian church, so proud and stubborn as she had formerly shown herself, could be brought under a necessary subordination to the civil magistrates, and whether the more fanatical part of it, whom Cargill and Cameron had led on, would

fall again into the ranks of social life. But here experience victoriously confuted these plausible apprehensions. It was soon perceived that the insanity of fanaticism subsides of itself, unless purposely heightened by persecution. The fiercer spirit of the sectaries was allayed by degrees; and, though vestiges of it may probably still be perceptible by observers, it has never, in a political sense, led to dangerous effects."

Hume Brown states the results of the revolution as these: Scotland had with the example and aid of England cast out its ancient line of princes; there had been for years a war between the dogma of the divine right of Presbyterianism and the dogma of the divine right of kings, ending in the annihilation of both antinomies, and "the definitive triumph of the secular over the theological spirit in the conduct of public affairs."¹

THE END OF TORTURE; THE MASSACRE AT GLENCOE (1693 A.D.)

The politics of Scotland in the first two years after the Revolution were more complicated than those of England. The ascendancy of the Presbyterians had been established; but the Episcopalians were still a formidable body. In 1689, although Episcopacy had been abolished, the church government had not been defined. There was no supreme directing power in affairs of religion. In 1690, the parliament of Scotland established the synodical authority; made the signature to the Confession of Faith the test of orthodoxy; and patronage was abolished, under certain small compensations to the patrons. The dissensions connected with these arrangements gave courage to those who looked to discord as the means for restoring the Stuart king.

A knot of turbulent and discontented men, known as "the club," entered into schemes for reversing all that had been accomplished by the Revolution. Their leaders were frightened, and informed against each other. Lord Anandale implicated the unhappy jacobite scribbler, Nevil Payne. He thought himself safer in Scotland than in London—a fatal mistake. We extract a passage in a letter from the earl of Cranford to the earl of Melville, the king's high-commissioner, to show how the ancient ferocity still lingered amongst the politicians of Scotland. The letter is dated December 11th, 1690: "Yesterday in the afternoon, Nevill Penn (after near an hour's discourse with him, in name of the council, and in their presence, though at several times by turning him out and then calling him in again) was questioned upon some things that were not of the deepest concern, and had but gentle torture given him, being resolved to repeat it this day. Which accordingly about six this evening we inflicted on both thumbs and one of his legs, with all the severity that was consistent with humanity, even unto that pitch that we could not preserve life and have gone further; but without the least success."

This was the last occasion on which Scottish statesmen were disgraced by endeavouring to extort evidence against political malcontents, by "all the severity that was consistent with humanity."¹ The noble actors in this plot offered up the obscure Nevil Payne as a sacrifice, secured their own safety, and suffered the Lowlands to settle down into peace.

King William, as early as March, 1690, manifested a wise disposition to tranquillise the Highlands by gentle measures. In the autumn of 1691, Breadalbane, having made his submission to the government, was authorised to treat with the heads of clans, and to expend twelve or fifteen thousand pounds in this work of pacification. It may well be doubted whether this

¹ "The law of England was the only code in Europe which dispensed with judicial torture."—BURTON.

[1691-1693 A.D.]

Highland earl went about his trust in perfect good faith. There was a strong suspicion that Breadalbane got the lion's share of the money which he pretended to be in the chest at London, but which was really in his own coffers.

The small clan, Macdonald of Glencoe, were bad neighbours to Breadalbane. MacIan their chief, as proud if not so great as Breadalbane, was wholly impracticable upon such terms. Others followed his example; and many clans remained in a state of inert rebellion. In August the government determined to bring the submission of the Highland chiefs to a decisive issue by a proclamation offering indemnity to all who should take the oaths on or before the last day of December, 1691, and threatening the extremities of military execution—in the old form of threatening the vengeance of fire and sword—against all and each who should not submit to the government, and swear to live in peace. But, says Burton,^o "Letters of fire and sword had been so ceaselessly issued against the Highlanders, that in the time of the Stuarts it was a usual and little noticeable form."

On the 31st of December all the clans had given their submission, with one exception—the Macdonalds of Glencoe. The submission of all the other chiefs who had been in arms against the government was an event which was not contemplated with satisfaction by the Master of Stair. Burnet^e says, "a black design was laid, not only to cut off the men of Glencoe, but a great many more clans, reckoned to be in all above six thousand persons." This may be a very loose assertion; but letters of Dalrymple, written to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton early in December, prove that he had an especial grudge against the Macdonalds. Burton^o considers that Dalrymple, from whose letters we now turn with such loathing, "only pursued the old policy of Scottish governments towards the Highlanders. The rule had always been to show no more consideration to Highlanders than to wild beasts."

On the 31st of December MacIan presented himself, with some of his clan, at Fort William, and offered to take the oaths before Colonel Hill. The commander of the garrison had no legal power to receive them; he was not a magistrate. Hill gave him a letter to the sheriff of Argyllshire. It was six days before he reached Inverary, over mountain paths covered with snow. The sheriff yielded to the old man's prayers and tears; administered the oath, and sent to the sheriff-clerk of Argyll, then at Edinburgh, a certificate to be laid before the council of the circumstances which had led him to do what was a departure from the letter of the proclamation, but which was within its spirit. The sheriff-clerk first tendered the certificate, with a copy of Hill's letter, to the clerks of the council, who refused to receive it. He then applied to individual privy counsellors, who would not interfere in the matter. The certificate was finally suppressed, and the general body of the council were kept in ignorance of it. On the 16th of January the instructions of the 11th were repeated, with verbal alterations, and with this addition: "As for MacIan of Glencoe and that tribe, if they can be well distinguished from the rest of the Highlanders, it will be proper for the vindication of public justice to extirpate that sect of thieves." Burnet^e alleges that "the king signed this, without any inquiry about it; for he was too apt to sign papers in a hurry." Those who doubt this allege that it was not only signed but superscribed by the king. Colonel Hill sent his orders to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton to march with eight hundred men straight to Glencoe. Hamilton addressed his orders to Major Duncanson, his second in command; concluding his letter by directing that the avenues be so secured "that the old fox, nor none of his cubs get away: The orders are that none be spared, nor the government troubled with prisoners." Major Duncanson then despatched Captain Robert

Campbell of Glenlyon, to proceed to Glencoe in advance of the other troops, with a detachment of a hundred and twenty men of Argyll's regiment. He arrived there on the 1st of February, 1692, and spent twelve days with his men amidst the somewhat unpoetical hospitalities of the clan. The MacIans had no affection for the Campbells; but Glenlyon's niece was married to the second son of their chief; and when he and his lieutenant, Lindsay, said they came as friends, and asked for quarters, being sent to relieve the garrison of Fort William, who were overcrowded, they were received with cordiality.

Undoubtedly the chief and his clansmen trusted to the indemnity of the government, which they thought had been secured by the oath which MacIan had taken before the sheriff of Argyll. Here they lived for twelve days as Highlander with Highlander. They had beef and spirits without payment. They were sheltered from the snow storms in the huts of the poor people. Glenlyon became affectionate over his usquebaugh with the husband of his niece; played at cards with the old chief; and entertained two of MacIan's sons at supper on the night of the 12th. At that time he had the following letter in his pocket from Major Duncanson, dated on the 12th from Ballachulis, in the immediate neighbourhood:

"You are hereby ordered to fall upon the rebels, the Macdonalds of Glencoe, and put all to the sword under seventy. You are to have especial care that the old fox and his sons do on no account escape your hands. You are to secure all the avenues, that no man escape. This you are to put in execution at five o'clock in the morning precisely, and by that time, or very shortly after it, I'll strive to be at you with a stronger party; if I do not come to you at five, you are not to tarry for me, but to fall on. This is by the king's special command, for the good and safety of the country, that these miscreants may be cut off, root and branch. See that this be put in execution without fear or favour, else you may expect to be treated as not true to the king and government, nor a man fit to carry commission in the king's service. Expecting you will not fail in the fulfilling hereof, as you love yourself, I subscribe these with my hand."

Captain Campbell did not tarry for his superior officer. He was strong enough to do his murderous bidding without his aid.

The cunning of the affair was characteristic of the mountain tribes. As Burton^o says, "Highland history is crowded with incidents which, in modern phraseology, would be stamped as treachery, but in the social system of the actors passed as dexterity." Some agitation amongst the Argyll soldiers—whisperings and murmurs—had roused the fears of John MacIan. He went at midnight to the house of Inverriggen, in the hamlet where Glenlyon was quartered. The captain was up and his men about him. He was ordered, he said, to march against Glengarry's people. Could he be likely to harm his friends, and especially those amongst whom his niece had married! Would he not have given a hint to Alaster? The man was satisfied. The night was stormy. The valley lay quiet in mists and thick darkness.

At five in the morning Glenlyon and his men slaughtered Inverriggen and nine other men. A child of twelve was stabbed by an officer bearing the name of Drummond. Lindsay and his party went to the house of the old chief and killed him as he was dressing himself, roused by his faithful servants. His two sons escaped amongst the rocks. His wife was stripped of her trinkets by the savages, and died the following day from her ill-usage. In another hamlet, Auchnaion, a sergeant of the name of Barbour, with his detachment, shot Auchentriater, and seven others, as they sat round the fire in the dark morning. It is reckoned that the number of the slaughtered was thirty-eight. Happily, the order that the avenues should be secured was not effectually carried out. Duncanson did not arrive in time. The reports of the murderous guns had alarmed the sleeping families, and three-fourths of

[1692-1695 A.D.]

the adults, with their wives and children, escaped by the passes before the troops of Hamilton had barred their way. No deed of blood remained for those who came to Glencoe, when the sun was high in the heavens, but to slay an old man of eighty. Their work was to burn the huts of the tribe and drive off their cattle.

But the unhappy fugitives who had escaped the slaughter had to endure all the extremities of hunger and cold in that inclement season. The number who perished in the snow, sank exhausted in the bogs, crept into caverns, and died for lack of food, was never ascertained. In a short time some few stole back to their half-ruined cabins, and in after years the valley had again a population. Amongst those who returned to the scene of desolation was the bard of the tribe. "The bard sat alone upon a rock, and looking down composed a long, dismal song."

In an age of publicity the extraordinary occurrences of the valley of Glencoe would have been known in a week in every corner of the realms. In an age when newspapers were uncommon, and gatherers of news by no means vigilant to minister to public curiosity, no Londoner knew of this tragedy, or, if he heard some rumour, heeded it not. After some weeks had elapsed there was a report that a robber tribe had been engaged with Scotch troops, and that the chief and some of his clan had been killed. At Edinburgh, people in the coffee-houses began to talk.

Charles Leslie, the non-juring clergyman, obtained some particulars of the deliberate treachery and cold-blooded ferocity which made the Glencoe massacre so peculiarly atrocious; and he published the circumstances about the end of 1692. A pamphlet, called *Gallienus Redivivus*, followed up this attack. Burnet says that the transaction at Glencoe "raised a mighty outcry, and was published by the French in their gazettes, and by the jacobites in their libels, to cast a reproach on the king's government as cruel and barbarous; though in all other instances it had appeared that his own inclinations were gentle and mild, rather to an excess." The affair would probably have rested with the French gazettes and jacobite libels, had not the parliament of Scotland, after a recess of two years, met in 1695, when Glencoe was a subject which had roused the nation to demand inquiry; for the non-jurors and friends of King James had worked diligently in stirring up the popular feeling. Political hostility to the master of Stair had something to do with the tardy indignation of the Scottish estates. William had in 1693 authorised an investigation of the matter by the duke of Hamilton and others. The duke died, and the inquiry was left to die with him.

The master of Stair was only dismissed from office by the king. Most persons will nevertheless agree with Macaulay^p that "in return for many victims immolated by treachery, only one victim was demanded by justice; and it must ever be considered as a blemish on the fame of William that the demand was refused."

This slaughter was devised by Scottish statesmen of the Lowlands, and carried through by Scottish captains of the Highlands. The treachery of this military execution was the device, in the old crafty and ferocious spirit of clan hostility, of the native soldiers to whom the slaughter was intrusted. Glencoe was not the last of the Highland massacres sanctioned by no intervention of King William, but by the old "letters of fire and sword" granted by the privy council of Scotland. The character of the monarch who signed the order is far more truly exemplified in one sentence of the Proclamation of Indemnity—"to interpret this indemnity in the most favourable and ample manner."

THE DESERTED COLONY OF DARIEN

The unfair treatment of the Scots in the matters of free trade and navigation, in which the new government appeared to follow the policy of Charles rather than that of Cromwell, and acted with an exclusive regard to the prejudices and supposed interests of England, reached a climax in the abandonment of the Scottish settlement at Darien when attacked by the Spaniards. The over-sanguine hopes of Paterson and the Scottish colonists and capitalists who supported this enterprise, so suddenly transformed into a financial disaster overwhelming to a poor country, accompanied by the loss of many lives, embittered the classes on which the Revolution settlement mainly depended for its support.

It was the anxious wish of William to have effected the legislative union; but, although he twice attempted it, the last time a month before his death, the temper of the English parliament and of the Scottish people appeared to give small chance of its realisation.⁴

SCOTCH OPPOSITION TO THE UNION WITH ENGLAND

"It may be done, but not yet," said King William to Defoe,^a speaking of that union which he so fervently desired. When commissioners were appointed in 1702 by an act of the English parliament, and the Scottish parliament responded by also appointing commissioners, each body being empowered to negotiate for a union, the difficulties of accomplishing this great measure were probably not correctly estimated. The "not yet" was not sufficiently manifest. These commissioners debated for six months without any result. The demands of the Scotch for a participation in the colonial trade were treated with indifference, as well as the demands for other commercial privileges that were to rest upon a perfect equality.

The Scottish parliament, or convention of estates, had sat from the time of the revolution. A new parliament was assembled in May, 1703. All the old feudal usages were strictly observed in the procession on this occasion called a "riding."

This parliament of 1703 was not in a temper of conciliation towards England. Glencoe and Darien were still watchwords of strife. The failure of the negotiations for union necessarily produced exasperation. Whilst Marlborough was fighting the battles of the allies, the Scottish parliament manifested a decided inclination to the interests of France by removing restrictions on the importation of French wines. The Act for the Security of the Kingdom was a more open declaration, not only of the independence of Scotland, but of her disposition to separate wholly from England—to abrogate, on the first opportunity, that union of the crowns which had endured for a century. The Act of Settlement, by which the crown of England was to pass in the Protestant line to the electress Sophia and her descendants, was not to be accepted; but on the demise of Queen Anne without issue the estates of Scotland were to name a successor from the Protestant descendants of the Stuart line, and that successor was to be under conditions to secure "the religious freedom and trade of the nation from English or any foreign influence." For four months this matter was vehemently debated in the Scottish parliament. The Act of Security was carried, but the lord high commissioner refused his assent.

Following the legislative commotion came what was called in England

[1704-1705 A.D.]

the Scottish plot—a most complicated affair of intrigue and official treachery, with some real treason at the bottom of it. The house of lords in England took cognisance of the matter, which provoked the highest wrath in Scotland, that another nation should interfere with her affairs; and this embroilment led to a dispute between the two houses of the English parliament about their privileges. When the Scottish estates reassembled in 1704 they denounced the proceedings of the house of lords as an interference with the prerogative of the queen of Scotland, and they again passed the Security Act. The royal assent was not now withheld; whether from fear or from policy on the part of the English ministry is not very clear.

The parliament of England then adopted a somewhat strong measure of retaliation. The queen was addressed, requesting her to put Carlisle, Newcastle, Tynemouth, and Hull in a state of defence, and to send forces to the border. A statute was passed which in the first place provided for a treaty of union, and then enacted that until the Scottish parliament should settle the succession to the crown in the same line as that of the English Act of Settlement, no native of Scotland, except those domiciled in England, or in the navy or army, should acquire the privileges of a natural-born Englishman; and prohibiting all importations of coals, cattle, sheep, or linen from Scotland. It was evident that there must be union or war.

In this defiant attitude towards England stood Scotland in 1704 and in 1705. Her mobs were howling for English blood before her courts of justice; her patriots were hooting and hissing when the name of the princess Sophia was uttered in the parliament house. In the words of Burton,^o "If a member said anything that could be construed as a leaning to England, cries to take down his words, or to send him to the castle, imported that scornful denunciation of his sentiments for which his opponents could not find argumentative expressions sufficiently powerful." This temper, which had lasted for several years, had filled the northern population of England with apprehensions of a Scottish war. The zealots of Scotland talked loudly of girding on their swords, and thought of Bannockburn. The rumours of border-feuds revived, and the stout borderers of Cumberland and Northumberland thought of Dunbar.

These apprehensions were happily averted by a show of moderation in the Scottish parliament; and by a consummate exercise of prudence on the part of Godolphin, who, as the head of a ministry chiefly composed of moderate whigs, had greater power than he had possessed when reconciling the divided opinions of the first years of his administration.

In August, 1705, the draft of an act for a treaty of union was brought into the Scottish parliament. Violent were the debates; but it was at last passed by a majority of two, but accompanied by a resolution that the commissioners for the treaty should not meet those in England until an offensive statute of the English parliament which had been recently passed should be repealed. It was proposed that this resolution should form part of the Scotch statute for a treaty; but the more moderate members carried that the resolution should be embodied in an address to the queen. In the new English parliament of 1705, the address of the Scots' parliament, "against any progress in the treaty of union, till the act which declared them aliens by such a day should be repealed," was laid before the two houses; and to the surprise of all parties the ministers of the queen advocated the repeal, not only as regarded the question of denying the Scots the privileges of native-born subjects, but as to the restrictions of that statute upon commercial intercourse.

[1706 A.D.]

The friendly hand was cordially held out; and if it were not as cordially grasped—if at some stages of the coming negotiations it were roughly pushed aside—it is to the immortal credit of the English statesmen that they went calmly forward with their great work, and accomplished it by honest perseverance, without trickery and without coercion. The reflecting politicians in both countries saw the perils that would result to both from being swayed by national prejudices and popular jealousies. There were old wounds to be healed, old injuries to be forgiven, existing injustice to be redressed, friendship to be established upon conditions of equal rights and liberties.

ARTICLES OF UNION AGREED UPON (1706 A.D.)

In the spring of 1706, thirty-one commissioners were nominated on the part of each kingdom, for negotiating the terms of union. On the 16th of April, the commissioners assembled in the cockpit at Whitehall. On the 22nd of July, the Articles of Union were finally agreed upon.

A complete union of two independent nations, to be brought about by common consent, and the terms to be settled as in a commercial partnership, was an event which seems natural and easy when we look to the geographical positions of the two nations, and to the circumstance that they had been partially united for a century, under six sovereigns wearing the crown of each kingdom. But when we look to the long-standing jealousies of the two nations—their sensitive assertions of ancient superiority—the usual haughty condescension of the wealthier country—the sturdy pride of the poorer—the ignorance of the bulk of each people of the true character of the other—the differences of the prevailing forms of religion—the more essential differences of laws and their modes of administration—we may consider the completion of this union as one of the greatest achievements of statesmanship.

As Burton^o says: "If those continental nations which had been for centuries accustomed to see annexations, partitions, and the enlargement of empires by marriage and succession, had been told how many different parties and interests it was necessary to bring to one set of conclusions before the desired end could be accomplished, they would have deemed the project utterly insane, as, indeed, it would have been, if laid before two nations less endowed with practical sense and business habits."

At the very outset of the treaty, the vital principle of union was to be debated (that fundamental article upon which all other articles were to be based); an entire union of the two kingdoms—one kingdom, one crown, one parliament. This article was proposed at the opening of the negotiations, by the English commissioners. The Scottish commissioners demurred. The descent of the crown of Scotland might go according to the Act of Settlement; mutual free-trade—mutual rights—a federal union. The English commissioners declined to proceed upon such terms, "convinced that nothing but an entire union of the two kingdoms will settle perfect and lasting friendship." The Scottish commissioners yielded; but at the same time demanded reciprocity of citizenship and of privileges of trade. Unquestionably so, replied the English commissioners. It was "a necessary consequence," they said, of the first great condition.

The fundamental principle of the union was thus settled, in the words of the resolution of the English commissioners, to be "an entire and incorporating union, by which the two nations should be formed into one government, be under one sovereign head, in one represented body, standing upon one foundation, enjoying equal privileges, and in common bearing one general

[1706 A.D.]

proportion of burdens, the same in end and mean, having but one common interest, one name, and being for ever hereafter but one people." How to carry out this amalgamation, in the several relations of "one represented body"—"one general proportion of burdens"—might have presented insuperable difficulties to any set of negotiators who were not thoroughly convinced of the necessity of making a compromise of many supposed particular interests.

The question of "proportion of burdens" claimed precedence of that of "one represented body." The English commissioners cleared away many objections, by proposing an equivalent to Scotland in a money payment, for any disadvantages she might be subjected to in a joint principle of finance. By a system of equal duties upon imports and exports, the freedom of trade was established, and to that system no objection could be rationally offered. There were long discussions about duties of excise—about malt, and salt, and ale—which were satisfactorily adjusted. The land tax was arranged in a manner eminently favourable to Scotland.

All these matters were got over, when the complex question of representation arose. The English commissioners proposed that Scotland should have thirty-eight members in the united house of commons. The Scottish commissioners proposed fifty. The number was settled at forty-five—about one-twelfth of the whole house. The system of electing peers to sit in parliament was also settled; sixteen being taken out of the hundred and fifty-four who were then peers of Scotland. The laws of Scotland, with the exception of those relating to trade, customs, and excise, were to remain in force, though subject to alterations by the parliament of Great Britain, as the united kingdom was to be called; it being provided "that laws relating to public policy are alterable at the discretion of the parliament; laws relating to private right are not to be altered, but for the evident utility of the people of Scotland."

The standards of the coin, of weights, and of measures, were to become uniform with those of England. For removing national distinctions, the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew were to be conjoined when used in flags, banners, standards, and ensigns. And as Burton^o says: "The coat armorial was to be quartered according to heraldic rules, so that in its employment for Scottish national purposes, the arms of Scotland might have the dexter, or pre-eminent side—a privilege for some time adopted, and not lightly esteemed." In the negotiations of the commissioners all matters relating to the church of Scotland were excluded. The preservation intact of the constitution and rights of that church was provided for in the acts of parliament under which the union was established.

The history of these negotiations has been told by Sir Walter Scott* with a bias which can only be attributed to that nationality which, in its intensification, may cease to be a virtue. He, who in the political questions of his own time was strenuously opposed to what may be called democratic principles, complains that the population of Scotland being as one to six, if the rule of population, "which seems the fairest that could be found, had been adopted, Scotland would have sent sixty-six members to the united parliament," instead of forty-five.

The whig, Hallam,ⁿ takes a very different view from the tory, Scott: "The ratio of population would indeed have given Scotland about one-eighth of the legislative body, instead of something less than one-twelfth; but no government, except the merest democracy, is settled on the sole basis of numbers; and if the comparison of wealth and of public contributions was to be admitted, it may be thought that a country which stipulated for itself to pay less than one-fortieth of direct taxation, was not entitled to a much greater

[1706 A.D.]

share of the representation than it obtained." Scott again takes occasion to accuse the Scottish commissioners of having "sold their own honour and that of Scotland," upon "being given to understand that a considerable sum out of the equivalent money would be secured for their especial use."

He then goes on to state, in the most precise way, from the papers of Lockhart, a furious jacobite, the names of the many recipients of the sum distributed, being £20,540 17s. 7d.; and says: "it may be doubted whether the descendants of the noble lords and honourable gentlemen who accepted this gratification, would be more shocked at the general fact of their ancestors being corrupted, or scandalised at the paltry amount of the bribe. One noble lord accepted of as low a sum as eleven guineas." Burton^o has shown that the sum which was unquestionably advanced by the English government was "employed in paying arrears of salary, or other debts. The general fact that at that time all classes of public creditors in Scotland were in arrear is too palpably notorious." The mere circumstance that arrears were paid out of an advance by England does not imply that there was a previous promise to pay, if the statesman should give a vote against the interests of his country. We lament with Burton,^o the more sober historian of Scotland, that "Sir Walter Scott's national pride seems to have been so entirely overwhelmed by his prejudice against the union, that no tale against its supporters is too degrading to secure his belief."

RIOTS IN SCOTLAND

It was on the 12th of October, 1706, when the estates of Scotland began to consider the Articles of Union. Immense pains had been taken by the opponents of the measure to rouse the people to a tumultuous opposition. They were in some degree successful. There was a riot in Edinburgh on the 23rd of October, when the populace broke the windows of Sir Patrick Johnson, who had been lord provost, and one of the commissioners of the treaty. They were dispersed without any loss of life. Those who consider that the outbreak of a mob—that appears to have been really very harmless—is evidence of the opinions of a nation, may agree with Lockhart^a that this midnight riot made "it evident that the union was crammed down Scotland's throat."

Unprecedented pains had been taken to rouse the passions of the people, and yet any tumult making an approach to insurrection cannot be traced, even in the most exaggerated narratives of those who represent the union as hateful to the Scottish people. Addresses, indeed, came from many places to the parliament against the incorporating principle of the union. Defoe, who was busily engaged in Edinburgh, in a sort of semi-official capacity—chiefly from his knowledge of commercial matters, on which he had made useful suggestions—had represented these addresses as got up by the political opponents of the treaty. Lockhart as quoted by Burton^o writes: "That vile monster and wretch, Daniel Defoe, and other mercenary tools and trumpeters of rebellion, have often asserted that these addresses, and other evidences of the nation's aversion to the union, proceeded from the false glosses and underhand dealings of those that opposed it in Parliament"; and then he admits that "perhaps this measure had its first original as they report."

Such arts were natural to be used, especially by the jacobites. They saw that the union would go far to destroy their hopes of a Stuart king for Scotland, if England persisted in her resolution of having no more right-divine sovereigns. The Cameronians held that the wicked union was a breach of the Solemn League and Covenant, they having been sworn to do their endeavour

[1706 A.D.]

to reform England in doctrine, worship, and discipline. But these were very far from representing the opinions of the dispassionate middle classes. Edinburgh shopkeepers were alarmed at the possible loss of customers; but calculating merchants saw very clearly the opening for successful enterprise, when the commerce of the two nations should be put upon an equal footing. The popular arguments against the union were chiefly appeals to nationality, which has always its amiable side, however it may sometimes exhibit a want of judgment in exact proportion to its enthusiasm.

There was an interval in the proceedings of the Scottish parliament when the parties for or against the union were gathering up their strength for a mortal conflict. The first great oratorical display was made by a young man, Lord Belhaven—a speech, says Defoe,^o “which, being so much talked of in the world, I have also inserted here.” It was, indeed, “much talked of in the world,” being wholly addressed to “the world”; and not very much fitted for a sober Scottish audience. Yet the “bended knees” and the choking passion of tears of this orator have had imitators in other solemn assemblies.

The speech, says Burton,^o “was circulated in all known shapes among the people, passed through unnumbered editions, and was so plentifully dispersed that a book-collector seldom buys a volume of Scottish political pamphlets of the early part of the eighteenth century, which does not contain *The*

Speech of the Lord Belhaven on the subject-matter of an Union betwixt the two kingdoms of Scotland and England.” This singular production has many of the characteristics of a noble eloquence; it has also not a few of those qualities which are most acceptable to a false taste. Lord Marchmont said when the speaker sat down, “Behold, he dreamed, but lo, when he awoke, he found it was a dream.”

When the vote was taken upon the first article of the treaty of union—viz., “That the two kingdoms of Scotland and England shall, upon the first day of May next ensuing the date hereof, and forever after, be united into one kingdom by the name of Great Britain”—there was a majority of thirty-three in favour of this fundamental proposition. There was a majority in each estate—of peers, of barons or representatives of counties, of representatives of towns. The second article for the succession of the monarchy, and the third for representation by one parliament, were also carried within the next fortnight. The question which was excepted from the treaty, that



DANIEL DEFOE (1661-1731)

[1707 A.D.]

of the church of Scotland, was then agitated; and it was resolved in a way which abated the fears of the Presbyterians, by passing a separate act to provide for the security of the church, which act was to be repeated as a part of any act of the Scottish or English parliament adopting the union. Under this statute, every sovereign of Great Britain, upon his or her accession, is to take an oath to protect the government, worship, discipline, rights, and privileges of the church of Scotland. The estates then proceeded to the consideration of the minute details of the remaining twenty articles of the treaty. This discussion lasted till the middle of January, 1707.

The opposition to the union beyond the walls of the Scottish parliament could scarcely be called national, in a large sense of the word. But it was, nevertheless, a formidable opposition, manifesting itself amongst very various parties and conditions of society. The duke of Queensberry, the queen's high commissioner, was instrumental in disarming the violence, both within the parliament and without, by his patience and moderation. Queensberry was threatened with assassination. He was told that two and twenty had subscribed an oath with their blood, by which they were bound together to assassinate him. No attempt was made to commit this crime. There was a second outbreak in Edinburgh, but there was no bloodshed.

Those who have been described as the fiercest mob in Europe were singularly harmless during the three months of excitement which preceded the passing of the Act of Union. There was a more serious riot at Glasgow on the 7th of November, which lasted several days. Those who had been fighting at Bothwell Bridge with a fury which Claverhouse and Balfour have impersonated for history and romance, were now united to hunt after an obdurate provost who had declined to sanction a city-address against the union. Jacobites and Cameronians—papists and hill-preachers—were masters for a time of the city of Glasgow. Says Defoe: "They ranged the streets and did what they pleased; no magistrate durst show his face to them; they challenged people as they walked the streets with this question, Are you for the union? and no man durst own it but at his extremest hazard." They searched for arms in private houses; and their rudeness, says Defoe, is not to be described. But this rude mob took no life away. "Except that there was no blood shed, they acted the exact part of an enraged, ungoverned multitude." A few of the leaders of these riots were taken, and the Glasgow baillies were soon relieved of their fears.

Vast things were expected from the junction of the true league and covenant men with the Jacobites, Papists, and Episcopalians. They were to march to Hamilton, seven thousand in number. The duke of Athol was to lead his Highlanders through the famous pass where Dundee scattered six thousand veterans. The duke of Hamilton was to head his motley army. The duke was wiser. He sent orders to the Highlanders and Cameronians to disperse and return home. The duke was unstable in his modes of opposition to the union. All parties began to look with suspicion upon his alternations of a hot and cold policy, and upon the blandishments of his mother towards the Presbyterians. "It was suggested," says Burnet, "that she and her son had particular views, as hoping that if Scotland should continue a separated kingdom, the crown might come into their family, they being the next in blood after King James' posterity."

THE ACT OF UNION CONSUMMATED (1707 A.D.)

Despite the jacobites and the Cameronians, the timid Presbyterians and the semi-papist Episcopalians, the act of the Scottish estates for the union

[1707-1708 A.D.]

was finally passed on the 16th of January, 1707, by a hundred and ten votes against sixty-nine. "And there's an end o' an auld sang," said the chancellor. It was an insult, cries the chivalrous Sir Walter Scott, "for which he deserved to be destroyed on the spot by his indignant countrymen." Belhaven complained that the union would compel the peers of Scotland to "lay aside their walking-swords when in company with the English peers, lest their self-defence should be called murder." We have outgrown the use of walking-swords, even for the self-defence which the Scottish peer thought a privilege of his order; certainly so for such homicide as the Scottish poet thought a fitting propitiation to the shades of the hundred and fourteen kings whose line began when Cheops was unborn.

Before the Scottish parliament separated they regulated the election of the representative peers, and the proportion of county and borough members of the commons. They had to arrange the division of the equivalent money, of which the Darien or African company had a large share. The last meeting of the Scottish estates was on the 26th of March, 1707.

The order of the Thistle, which had been revived by Queen Anne in 1703, was not filled up by elections till some few years had elapsed. James II had contemplated the restitution of the order, but no patent for this object had passed the great seal. There was now in the possession of the crown the means of bestowing a great distinction, essentially national; for in the statutes of 1703 the number of knights was limited to twelve peers of Scotland, the sovereign being the head. This number somewhat profanely kept in view the precedent of the Saviour and the twelve apostles. George I broke through the principle of exclusive nationality by bestowing the honour upon a few English peers. George IV overturned the scriptural character by raising the number of knights to sixteen.

The parliament of England had met in December, during the anxious discussion in Scotland of the articles of the treaty of union. At the end of January the queen sent to the house of peers and announced that the treaty for a union had been ratified by act of parliament in Scotland, with some alterations and additions. The articles were then presented. In the lords, a bill was brought in for the security of the church of England as by law established; the movers having, of course, a slight apprehension that the sovereign's oath to preserve the church of Scotland might be liable to misconstruction unless thus qualified. The debates in the English parliament on the principle of the union were animated, but were not violent. The ministry were anxious to pass the bill for the union, without making any alteration in the articles as adopted by the Scottish parliament. They succeeded in preventing a debate on each clause by inserting the articles in the preamble of the bill, with the two acts for the security of the churches of each country. By this device the measure was to be accepted or rejected as a whole. It was passed without difficulty, and on the 6th of March, 1707, the queen gave the royal assent.

AFTERMATH OF THE UNION

Two acts of the British parliament naturally followed the Act of Union. The Scottish privy council was abolished in 1708. A secretary of state for Scotland continued until 1746 to manage the Scottish department in London; but the lord advocate, the adviser of the crown on all legal matters both in London and Edinburgh, gradually acquired a large, and after the suppression of the office of the Scottish secretary a paramount influence

in purely Scottish affairs, though he was nominally a subordinate of the home secretary.¹

In 1709 the law of treason was assimilated to that of England, being made more definite and less liable to extension by construction in the criminal courts. In the later years of Anne, when after the fall of Marlborough power passed from the whig to the tory party, two statutes were passed of a different character. Patronage was restored in the Presbyterian church notwithstanding the protests of the assembly, and proved a fertile source of discord. A limited toleration act in favour of the Episcopalians, permitting them to worship in private chapels, was opposed by the Presbyterians but carried.

With the union of the parliaments Scotland lost its legislative independence. Its representation in the British parliament for more than a century, based on the freehold franchise in the counties and in the burghs controlled by town councils, which were close corporations, was a representation of special classes and interests rather than of the nation. It almost appeared as if the prophecy of Belhaven would be accomplished and there would be an end of an old song. But Scottish history was not destined yet to end. The character of the people, though their language and manners gradually became more like those of England, remained distinct. They retained a separate church and clergy. Independent courts and a more cosmopolitan system of law opened a liberal profession and afforded a liberal education to youthful ambition. A national system of parish schools, burgh schools, and universities, though inadequately endowed and far from reaching the ideal of Knox and Melville, gave opportunities to the lower as well as the higher classes of receiving at a small cost an education suited for practical uses and the business of everyday life.

The Scot had been from the earliest times more inclined to travel, to migrate, to colonise than the Englishman, not that he had a less fervent love of home, but a soil comparatively poor made it necessary for many to seek their fortune abroad. This tendency which had led Scottish monks, soldiers, and professors to embrace foreign service, now found new openings in trade, commerce, colonial enterprise in America, the East and the West Indies, in the southern hemisphere and the exploration of unknown parts of the globe. Accustomed to poverty, Scottish emigrants acquired habits of frugality, industry, and perseverance, and were rewarded by success in most of their undertakings. Nor, if war be regarded as necessary to the continued existence of a nation, was it altogether absent, but the cause with which the name of Scotland became identified was the losing one.

The two rebellions proved the devoted loyalty which still attached many of the Highland clans, the Catholics, and some of the Episcopalians to the descendants of the Stuarts. But that in 1715, preceded by an abortive attempt in 1708, was put down by a single battle. Sheriffmuir, if it could scarcely be claimed as a victory by Argyll, led to the speedy dispersal of the clans which had gathered round the standard of Mar.

Thirty years later the romantic rising of the Highlanders under the young Pretender found the government unprepared. Once more for a brief space Holyrood was a royal court. The defeat of Cope at Prestonpans and the rapid march of the Scottish army, slightly reinforced by Catholics from the northern and midland shires of England, to Derby, by which it cut off the duke of Cumberland's forces from the capital, made London tremble. Divided counsels, the absence of any able leader, and the smallness of their number (not more than five thousand) prevented the daring policy of attacking Lon-

¹ In 1885 a secretary for Scotland was again appointed with a separate office at Dover House, London.

[1745-1747 A.D.]

don, which Charles himself favoured, and a retreat was determined on. It was skilfully effected, and on the 26th of December the little army, which had left Edinburgh on the 31st of October and reached Derby on the 4th of December, arrived in Glasgow.

It was not favourably received, the southwest of Scotland being the district least inclined to the Stuarts, and it marched on Stirling to assist Lord John Drummond and Lord Strathallan, who had commenced its siege, which General Hawley threatened to raise. His defeat at Falkirk was the last success of the jacobites. The duke of Cumberland was sent to command the royal forces, and Charles Edward was forced by Lord George Murray and the Highland chiefs to abandon the siege of Stirling and retreat to Iverness. He was at once pursued by the duke, and his defeat at Culloden (the 16th of April, 1746) scattered his followers and compelled him to seek safety in flight



THE CULLODEN MONUMENT

to the Hebrides, from which, after five months' wanderings, he escaped to France.

The last rebellion within Great Britain was put down with severity. Many soldiers taken in arms were shot and no consideration was shown to the wounded. The chief officers and even some privates taken prisoners were tried and executed at various places in the north of England. The earls of Cromarty and Kilmarnock and Lord Balmerino were reserved for the judgment of their peers in London, and having pleaded guilty were beheaded at Tower Hill. The crafty Lovat, who had avoided appearing in arms, but was really at the bottom of the rising, though he pretended to serve both sides, was the last to suffer. An act of indemnity was passed a few weeks after his execution.

But effective measures were taken to prevent any renewal of the rebellion. The estates and titles of all who had been privy to it were forfeited. An act was passed prohibiting the use of arms and the Highland dress; and the abolition of the military tenure of ward-holding, unfortunately preserved at the union, rooted out the remnants of feudal and military power till then left in the hands of the nobles and chiefs. These changes in the law had the willing consent of the Lowland and burghal population in Scotland, to whom the

lawless and freebooting habits of the Highlanders had been a cause of frequent loss and constant alarm.

Somewhat later the masterly policy of Pitt enlisted the Scottish Celts in the service of the crown by forming the Highland regiments. The recollection of Glencoe and Culloden was forgotten after the common victories of the British arms in India, the Peninsula, and Waterloo. In one direction the jacobite cause survived its defeat. Poetry seized on its romantic incidents, idealised the young prince who at least tried to win his father's crown, satirised the foreign and German, the whig and covenanting, elements opposed to the Stuart restoration, and substituted loyalty for patriotism. Self-sacrifice and devotion to a cause believed right, though deserted by fortune (qualities rare amongst the mass of any nation), dignified the jacobites like the cavaliers with some of the nobler traits of chivalry, and the jacobite ballads have their place in literature as one of the last expiring notes of mediæval romance. Music and tradition fortunately preserved their charm before the cold hand of history traced the sad end of Charles Edward, the pensioner of foreign courts, wasting his declining years in ignoble pleasures.

It might be hard to say whether the first Hanoverians or the last Stuarts least deserved that men should fight and die for them; but the former represented order, progress, civil and religious liberty; the latter were identified with the decaying legend of the divine right of kings and the claim of the Roman church not merely to exclusive orthodoxy but to temporal power and jurisdiction inconsistent with the independence of nations and freedom of conscience. Although a larger minority in Scotland than in England clung to the traditions of the past, an overwhelming majority of the nation, including all its progressive elements, were in favour of the new constitution and the change of dynasty.

COMMERCE AND CULTURE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

During the remaining half of the eighteenth century and the commencement of the nineteenth a period of prosperity was enjoyed by Scotland, and the good effects of the union, intercepted by the rebellions, became visible. The Scottish nation, without losing its individuality, was stimulated by contact and friendly rivalry with its English neighbour in the arts of peace. It advanced in intellectual as well as material respects more than in any part of its previous history. It became, through commerce, manufactures, and improved agriculture a comparatively rich instead of a poor country. Skilful engineering made the Clyde a successful competitor with the Thames and the Mersey, and Glasgow became one of the most populous cities in Great Britain. The industrial arts made rapid progress, and the fine arts began to flourish. The art of saving capital and using it as a source of credit was reduced to a system.


Banks, not unknown in other countries and at an earlier date, are in their modern form a Scottish invention. Besides those which sprang up in Scotland itself, the national banks of England and France owed their origin to two Scotsmen. A safe system of life insurance represented the provident habits and business talents of the nation. Adam Smith shares with the French economists the honour of founding political economy as the science of the wealth of nations. Mental philosophy became a favourite study, and a distinctively Scottish school produced thinkers who deeply influenced the later systems of the Continent. The history not of Scotland only but of England

[1750-1900 A.D.]

and some portions of that of Europe were written by Scotsmen in works equal to any existing before Gibbon.

The dawn of the scientific era of the nineteenth century was foreshadowed by Scottish men of science, the founders of modern geology, chemistry, anatomy, physiology, and the practice of medicine. In Scotland was made the first of the great line of discoveries in the practical application of science by the use of steam as a motive power.

The same period—so varied were its talents—gave birth to two Scottish poets of world-wide fame. Burns expressed the feelings and aspirations of the people; Scott described both in verse and prose their history and the picturesque scenes in which it had been transacted. During the last half-century the material progress continued, but the intellectual was too brilliant to last. The preponderating influence of England even threatened to extinguish native Scottish genius by centralising the political and social life of the island in the English capital. Only two changes of importance occurred. The political institutions of Scotland were reformed by a series of acts which placed the franchise on a broader basis and made the representation of the people real. The established church, already weakened by secessions, was further divided by a disruption largely due to the ignorance of the political leaders as to the deep-seated aversion of the nation to any interference with the independence of the church, especially in matters of patronage. Educational reform has also in recent years raised the standard of the universities and schools without injuring their popular character. While it would be incorrect to say that Scotland has had no independent history since the union, that history must be chiefly read in the annals of its church, its law, and its literature. Its political existence has been absorbed in that of Great Britain.^d



SCOTT'S TOMB

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS

[The letter ^a is reserved for Editorial Matter.]

CHAPTER I. THE EARLY HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

^b J. A. FROUDE, address to the University of Saint Andrews.—^c W. F. SKENE, *Celtic Scotland: a History of Ancient Alban*.—^d J. H. RAMSAY, *The Foundations of England*.—^e J. RHYE, *Early Britain, Celtic Britain*.—^f TACITUS, *Agricola*.—^g PTOLEMY, *Geography*.—^h ROBERT LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE, *Chronicles of Scotland*.—ⁱ ALEXANDER GORDON, *Itinerarium Septentrionale*.—^j GEORGE CHALMERS, *Caledonia*.—^k DION CASSIUS, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία*.—^l AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum Gestarum libri XXXI*.—^m WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—ⁿ HECTOR BOECE, *History of Scotland*.—^o GEORGE BUCHANAN, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.—^p WILLIAM CAMDEN, *Britannia*.—^q PROCOPIUS, *Historia Arcana*.—^r BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History of England*.—^s GILDAS, *De Excidio Britannia*.—^t NENNIVS, *Historia Britonum*.—^u IRISH ANNALS.—^v CHRONICLE OF THE PICTS AND SCOTS.—^w ADAMNAN, *Life of St. Columba*.—^x CUMINE (OUMINIUS), *Life of St. Columba*.—^y TERTULLIAN.—^z P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^{aa} JULIUS CÆSAR, *Commentarii*.—^{ab} ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE.—^{ac} RAPHAEL HOLINSHED, *Scottish Chronicles*.—^{ad} AENEAS J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^{ae} ANDREW WYNTOUN, *Orygynale Oronykil of Scotland*.—^{af} MARIANUS SCOTUS, *Chronicon Universale*.—^{ag} E. W. ROBERTSON, *Scotland Under Her Early Kings*.—^{ah} EDWARD A. FREEMAN, *History of the Norman Conquest in England*.—^{ai} FLORENCE OF WORCESTER, *Chronicle*.

CHAPTER II. FROM MALCOLM CANMORE TO DAVID I (1058-1153 A.D.)

^b P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^c A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^d ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE.—^e W. STUBBS, *The Constitutional History of England*.—^f ALLEN, *Vindication of the Ancient Independence of Scotland*.—^g C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^h ÆTHELWARD CHRONICOLE, in *Savile's Scriptores Post Bedam*.—ⁱ IRISH ANNALS.—^j WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De Regum gestis Anglorum libri V*.—^k FLORENCE OF WORCESTER, *Chronicle*.—^l E. A. FREEMAN, *The Reign of William Rufus*.—^m BISHOP TURGOT, *Life of St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland*.—ⁿ W. F. SKENE, *Celtic Scotland*.—^o GEORGE CHALMERS, *Caledonia*.—^p ETHELRED (OF AILRED), "De Bello Standardi," in R. Twysden's *Historia Anglicana Scriptores decem*.—^q LORD HAILES, *Annals of Scotland*.—^r WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^s J. RHYE, *Celtic Britain*.—^t BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*.—^u E. W. ROBERTSON, *Scotland Under Her Early Kings*.

CHAPTER III. THE LAST CELTIC KINGS (1153-1286 A.D.)

^b COSMO INNES, *Scotland in the Middle Ages*.—^c P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^d WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^e LORD HAILES, *Annals of Scotland*.—^f C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^g E. W. ROBERTSON, *Scotland Under Her Early Kings*.—^h T. WRIGHT, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ MATTHEW PARIS, *Chronica Majora*.—^j BISHOP TURGOT, *Life of St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland*.—^k C. INNES, *Sketches of Early Scottish History and Social Progress*.

CHAPTER IV. THE DAYS OF WALLACE (1286-1305 A.D.)

^b W. BURNS, *The Scottish War of Independence*.—^c J. H. BURTON, *The History of Scotland from Agricola's Invasion*.—^d PETER LANGTOFT, *Chronicle of England*.—^e JOHN DE FORDUN, *Scotichronicon*.—^f WALTER DE HEMINGBURGH, *Chronicle of England*, in *Maitland Club Wallace*

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS 329

Papers.—^a HENRY KNIGHTON, *Chronicle*.—^b MATTHEW OF WESTMINSTER, *Flores Historiarum*.—^c LORD HAILES, *Annals of Scotland*.—^d WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^e P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^f A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^g JOSEPH BAIN, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*.—^h T. WRIGHT, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ H. B. GEORGE, *Battles of English History*.—^j E. A. FREEMAN, *Historical Essays*.—^k ANDREW WYNTOUN, *Orygynale Chronykil of Scotland*.—^l BLIND HARRY, *Wallace*.—^m A. F. MURISON, *Sir Wm. Wallace*.—ⁿ LORD ROSEBERRY, address at the Stirling Celebration in 1897.

CHAPTER V. ROBERT BRUCE (1306-1329 A.D.)

^a J. SPEED, *History of Great Britain*.—^b J. H. BURTON, *History of Scotland from Agricola's Invasion*.—^c A. F. MURISON, *Sir Wm. Wallace*.—^d T. F. TOUT, *Edward the First*.—^e F. PALGRAVE, *Documents and Records Illustrative of English History*.—^f P. F. TITTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^g W. BURNS, *The Scottish War of Independence*.—^h WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ H. F. BUCKLE, *History of Civilisation in England*.—^j ROBERT KERR, *History of Scotland during the Reign of Robert I.*—^k JOHN BARBOUR, *The Bruce*.—^l JOHN LINGARD, *History of England*.—^m A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Robert the Bruce" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—ⁿ J. A. FROUDE, *History of England*.—^o DEAN STANLEY, *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*.—^p THOMAS WALSHINGHAM, *History of England from the Time of Edward II to Henry V.*—^q JEAN FROISSART, *Chronicles*.—^r LORD HAILES, *Annals of Scotland*.—^s JAMES MACKINNON, *The History of Edward III.*—^t JOHN DE FORDUN, *Scotichronicon*.—^u E. A. FREEMAN, *Historical Essays*.—^v MATTHEW PARIS, *Chronica Majora*.—^w GIRALDUS CAMBERGENSIS, *Descriptio Cambriae*.—^x CHRONICLE OF LANERCOST.—^y C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *The Comprehensive History of England*.—^z WALTER BOWER, *Continuation of Fordun*.

CHAPTER VI. DAVID II AND THE BALIOLS (1329-1371 A.D.)

^a GOLDWIN SMITH, *Irish History and Irish Character*.—^b A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^c P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^d JEAN FROISSART, *Chronicles*.—^e J. MACKINNON, *The History of Edward III.*—^f WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^g P. F. TITTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^h ANDREW WYNTOUN, *Orygynale Chronykil*.

CHAPTER VII.—THE ACCESSION OF THE STUARTS (1371-1424 A.D.)

^a J. MACKINNON, *The History of Edward III.*—^b JEAN FROISSART, *Chronicles*.—^c T. WRIGHT, *History of Scotland*.—^d THOMAS PERCY, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*.—^e P. F. TITTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^f ANDREW WYNTOUN, *Orygynale Chronykil*.—^g J. BAIN, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*.—^h P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ W. BOWER, *Continuation of Fordun*.—^j WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.

CHAPTER VIII. ROYALTY VS. NOBILITY: JAMES I TO JAMES III (1424-1487 A.D.)

^a JOHN DE FORDUN, *Scotichronicon*.—^b P. F. TITTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^c WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^d J. H. RAMSAY, *Lancaster and York*.—^e HECTOR BOECE, *History of Scotland*.—^f LIBER PLUSCARDENSIS, in *Skene's Historians of Scotland*.—^g W. ROBERTSON, *History of Scotland*.—^h G. BURNET, *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*.—ⁱ P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^j JEAN DE WATRYN, *Antiquaires Chroniques d'Angleterre*.—^k G. BUCHANAN, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.—^l J. PINKERTON, *History of Scotland from the Accession of the House of Stuart to that of Mary*.—^m JOHN MAJOR (OF MAIR), *History of Greater Britain*.—ⁿ F. FERRERIUS, *Continuation of Boece*.—^o R. LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE, *The Chronicles of Scotland*.—^p PATRICK ABERCROMBY, *Martial Achievements of the Scots Nation*.—^q T. RYMER, *Fœdera*.

CHAPTER IX. JAMES IV AND FLODDEN FIELD (1488-1513 A.D.)

^a P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^b G. BUCHANAN, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.—^c T. WRIGHT, *History of Scotland*.—^d PEDRO DE AYALA, in the *Calendar of State Papers Preserved in the Archives at Simanca*, edited by Bergenroth and Gayangos.—^e R. LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE, *The Chronicles of Scotland*.—^f WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^g JEAN FROISSART, *Chronicles*.—^h AENEAS SYLVIVS, *Epistola*.—ⁱ C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^j J. MAJOR, *History of Greater Britain*.—^k P. F. TITTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^l J. PINKERTON, *History of Scotland*.—^m W. BOWER, *Continuation of Fordun*.—ⁿ MALCOLM LAISO, *History of Scotland*.—^o GEORGE BRODIE, *History of the British Empire*.—^p NIMMO, *History of Stirlingshire*.

330 BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS

CHAPTER X. JAMES V AND MARY STUART (1518-1569 A.D.)

^b H. F. BUCKLE, *History of Civilisation in England*.—^c WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^d J. PINKERTON, *History of Scotland*.—^e P. F. TYTLER, *History of Scotland*.—^f P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^g JOHN KNOX, *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.—^h W. ROBERTSON, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^j PIERRE DE BRANTÔME, *Vies des grands capitaines*.

CHAPTER XI. CROWN AGAINST KIRK UNDER JAMES VI (1569-1603 A.D.)

^b H. HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England*.—^c JAMES MELVILLE, *Memoirs of His Own Life*.—^d G. BUCHANAN, *Rerum Scotticarum Historia*.—^e P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland*.—^f J. A. FROUDE, *History of England*.—^g A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^h THOS. CARLYLE, *Heroes and Hero-Worship*.—ⁱ WALTER SCOTT, *History of Scotland*.—^j JOHN SPOTTISWOODE, *History of the Church of Scotland*.—^k M. A. S. HUME, *Calendar of State Papers in the Archives at Simancas*.—^l J. MELVILLE, *Diary*.—^m J. H. BURTON, *History of Scotland*.—ⁿ C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^o C. KNIGHT, *Popular History of England*.—^p LOUIS A. BARRE, *Tragedy of Gowrie House*.

CHAPTER XII. THE GRADUAL UNION WITH ENGLAND (1603-1707 A.D.)

^b W. BURNS, *The War of Independence*.—^c ROBERT VAUGHAN, *History of England Under the Stuarts*.—^d A. J. G. MACKAY, article on "Scotland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^e G. BURNET, *History of His Own Times*.—^f C. KNIGHT, *Popular History of England*.—^g C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^h M. LAING, *History of Scotland*.—ⁱ D. HUME, *History of England*.—^j P. HUME BROWN, *History of Scotland from the Revolution to the Extinction of the Jacobite Insurrection*.—^k ROBERT WODROW, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution*.—^l ARCHIBALD STEWART, *History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs*.—^m JOHN DALRYMPLE, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*.—ⁿ H. HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England*.—^o J. H. BURTON, *History of Scotland*.—^p T. B. MACAULAY, *History of England*.—^q DANIEL DEFOE, *History of the Union*.—^r WALTER SCOTT, *Tales of a Grandfather*.—^s GEORGE LOCKHART, *Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland*.



BOOK V

THE HISTORY OF IRELAND

CHAPTER I

EARLY HISTORY AND THE ANGLO-NORMAN CONQUEST

When two countries, or sections of countries, stand geographically so related to one another that their union under a common government will conduce to the advantage of one of them, such countries will continue separate as long only as there is equality of force between them, or as long as the country which desires to preserve its independence possesses a power of resistance so vigorous that the effort to overcome it is too exhausting to be permanently maintained.—FROUDE.*

LEGENDARY HISTORY OF EARLY RACES

CIRCUMSTANCES were favourable in Ireland to the growth and preservation of ethnic legends. Among these favourable circumstances were the long continuance of tribal government, and the existence of a special class whose duty it was to preserve the genealogies of the ruling families, and keep in memory the deeds of their ancestors. Long pedigrees and stories of forays and battles were preserved, but under the necessary condition of undergoing gradual phonetic change according as the popular language altered. During many centuries there had been no conquest by foreign races to destroy these traditions; internal conquests and displacements of tribes confuse but do not eradicate traditions and pedigrees.

When the Irish were converted to Christianity and became acquainted with the story of the deluge, the confusion of tongues, and the unity of the human race, the *suide* (sages) naturally endeavoured to fill up the gap between their eponyms and Noah. The pedigrees now began to be committed to writing, and, as they could for the first time be compared with one another, a wide field was opened to the inventive faculties of the scribes. The result has been the construction of a most extraordinary legendary history, which under the constant care of official *suide* acquired a completeness, fulness, and a certain degree of consistency which is wonderful.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries this legendary history was fitted with a chronology, and synchronised with the annals of historical nations. We may assume with confidence that a history of a group of tribes admittedly of diverse origins, consisting mainly of names of persons and battles transmitted by memory, must necessarily lack all proportion, not alone as regards absolute, but even as regards relative time; that personages and events may appear in the background that should be in the foreground, and the converse;

may, even that the same personages and events may figure at times and places far apart.

Keeping these things in view, the *Lebar Gabhala*, or *Book of Invasions*, a curious compilation, or rather compilations, for there are several editions of it, of the ethnic legends of Ireland, will help us to give the main facts of the early peopling of Ireland. Our guide records the coming of five principal peoples, namely, the followers of Partholan or Bartholomew, those of Nemed, the Firbolgs, the Tuatha Dé Danann, and the Scots or Milesians.^b

Partholan and his people were supposed to have come from middle Greece. For three centuries they occupied Ireland, and then all died of a plague. The next comers were the Nemedians who under their king, Nemed, came from Scythia in thirty ships, each carrying thirty warriors. Like Partholan's people they, too, or at any rate most of them, died of the plague; but not until after they had left records of heroic fighting with a seafaring race of invaders, known as the Formorians, who gained some sort of a foothold on the island. The next colonising race, the Firbolgs, seem to have landed at five different places under several chiefs. They were apparently of British origin. The Firbolgs had brought the entire island in subjection before the coming of the fourth race of colonists, the Tuatha Dé Danann. According to the legends, these newcomers were descendants of some of the race of Nemed, who had escaped the fury of the plague and the swords of the Formorians. The newcomers fought with the Firbolgs for the sovereignty of the island and worsted them. The last of the prehistoric races of Ireland were the Scots,¹ or as they were sometimes called, the Milesians.^a

With all their drawbacks, the Irish ethnic legends, when stripped of their elaborate details and biblical and classical loans, express the broad facts of the peopling of Ireland, and are in accordance with the results of archaeological investigation. At the earliest period the country was well wooded, and the interior full of marshes and lakes; it was occupied by a sparse population, who appear in later times as "forest tribes" (Tuatha Feda), and were doubtless of the aboriginal (Iberic) race of western and southern Europe. The story of Partholan represents the incoming of the first bronze-armed Celts, who were a Goidelic tribe akin to the later Scots that settled on the sea-coast, and built the fortresses occupying the principal headlands. They formed with the forest tribes the basis of the population in the Early Bronze age. Afterwards came the various tribes known by the general name of Firbolgs.

It is not necessary to suppose that all the tribes included under this name came at the same time, or even that they were closely akin. The legend names several tribes, and tells us that they came into Ireland at different places from Britain. The effect of their immigrations now appears to have been that in the north the people were Cruithni, or Picts of the Goidelic branch of the Celts; in the east and centre, British and Belgic tribes; and in Munster, when not distinctly Iberic, of a southern or Gaulish type.

The fertile plain lying between the Wicklow and Carlingford mountains was occupied by the tribe of Nemed before the arrival of the Firbolgs, if we believe the legend; but the event certainly belongs to a later period, though still to the time of the movements and displacement of peoples which led to the immigration of those tribes. The Formorians, with whom the Nemedians fought, may have been merely some of those incoming tribes. The Irish legend

¹ The Scots carried their pedigree back without a break to Noah. The immediate eponym of the new race was Galam from Gal, valour, a name which might be expressed by the Latin *miles*, a knight, whence came the names Milesius and Milesians.

[ca. 100 B.C.-1 A.D.]

brings the Nemedians from the east of Europe, which, of course, means only that they came from a distance, perhaps from Armorica or some other part of Gaul.

The Milesian legend seems to consist of two or perhaps of three events. Eber and Erimon, two sons of Galam, or Milesius, the leaders of the invading forces, fight a battle at Sleab Mis in western Kerry with the Tuatha De Danann, whom they defeat. Eber or Heber then marches to Tailti in Meath, while his brother Erimon or Heremon sails round to the mouth of the Boyne, where he lands and marches to meet his brother advancing from the south. This skilful strategic movement betrays the late invention of the legend. The first fact that underlies the story is the incoming of some powerful and well-armed tribe who seized upon the plain between the Liffey and the Boyne, and made it the centre of an encroaching power.

The new tribes arrived in Ireland towards the close of the prehistoric period, and not long before the beginning of the Christian era, or possibly as late as the first century of it. They were Goidelic, and were related to the dominant clans of Munster and Ulster, though perhaps not so closely to the latter as to the former. When the sons of Galam had defeated the kings of the tribes of the Dé Danann, they partitioned Ireland between themselves and their kinsmen. Erimon got Leinster and Connaught; Eber Find, his brother, north Munster; Lugaid, son of Ith, brother of Galam, south Munster, and Eber, son of Ir, son of Galam, Ulster.

Eber Find, the leader of the north Munster tribes, and Lugaid of south Munster, were grandsons of Breogan, the stem-father of all the new tribes. A long struggle took place between their descendants, in which those of Eber Find ultimately gained the upper hand, and the descendants of Lugaid were gradually pressed into a corner of the county of Cork. This struggle and the position of the tribes of Eber in the plain of Munster seem to show that the latter were, what the legend pretends, a part of the incoming tribes which we shall henceforward call Scots. There seems little doubt that these clans of Breogan or Scots were closely related to the Brigantes, perhaps they were even tribes of that great clan. The Brigantes who occupied the basin of the Barrow and Nore, and ultimately the county Waterford, according to Ptolemy, support this view. The clan of Lugaid, grandson of Breogan, is almost certainly that which used the Ogam inscribed stones, the last that came into the country, and with which originated the story of the migration from Spain.

THE SCOTI

The opening of the historic period was marked by a great struggle of tribes, which took place about the beginning of the Christian era, and of which Irish annalists have left us but very scanty information, and that confused and misleading. This struggle was brought about by the arrival from abroad of a new tribe, or the rise of an old one. The former view seems the more probable, for at that time great displacements of the Celts were taking place everywhere consequent on the conquests of the Romans, and some of the displaced tribes may have migrated to Ireland. The victors in the struggle appear afterwards as Scots; the conquered tribes are called Aithech Tuatha, that is, vassal tribes, because they paid *daer* or base rent.

The victors consisted of forty-six tribes, among them being the Scotraige or Scotraide. This tribe probably took a foremost place in the subsequent invasions of Britain; and, it having thus acquired the leadership of the free

clans, the latter became all known to foreigners as the *Scoti*, a name which was subsequently extended to the whole people. That this was the way in which the name was first given is shown by its not having been used in Irish, but only in Latin documents.

In the struggle between the free and servile tribes the latter appear to have succeeded in throwing off the yoke of the free clans or *Scots*, but after some time the latter, under the leadership of Tuathal, called *Techtmár*, or the Legitimate (*ob. cir.* 160 A.D.), recovered their power and took effective measures to preserve it by making some kind of redistribution of the servile tribes, or more probably making a plantation of *Scots* among them, and building fortresses capable of affording mutual aid. The duns and raths on the great central plain of Ireland to which Tuathal's measure was probably confined appear to have been erected on some strategic plan of this kind, intended to keep up a chain of communication, and prevent the combination of the servile classes. Tuathal in fact founded a kind of feudal system which ruled Ireland while the *Scotic* power endured.¹

Another measure of Tuathal was the formation of the kingdom of Meath to serve as mensal land of the *ard ri* or over-king. He was not only the founder of the central monarchy, but also it would seem the organiser of the religious system of the people, which he used as a means of securing the allegiance of their princes by holding their chief shrines in his power, while leaving them the rents derived from them. An act of Tuathal, which marks his power and the firm grasp which he had secured over the country, was the infliction of a heavy fine on the province of Leinster, a legend tells us, for an insult offered to him by one of its kings. This fine, called the *boroim laigen* or cow-tribute of Leinster, was levied until the sixth century. It was a constant source of oppression and war while it lasted, and helped to cripple the power of Leinster.

To carry out his measures of conquest and subjugation Tuathal is credited with having established a kind of permanent military force which afterwards became so celebrated in legendary story as the *Fiann* or *Fenians*. He may have seen Roman troops, and attempted as far as his circumstances would permit to form a military tribe organised somewhat after the manner of a legion. Among the other measures attributed to Tuathal was the regulation of the various professions and handicrafts. The former he must necessarily have done as part of his religious organisation, for the various professions were merely the grades of the druidical hierarchy.

RISE OF MUNSTER AND CONQUEST OF ULSTER

If we accept the story of the plantation of the broken *Aithech Tuatha*, Tuathal's power must have extended over the whole country; but it was practically confined to Meath and Leinster, and perhaps *Ólnegmacht*. Ulaid was independent. In Munster the clan of *Degaid* had conquered a large tract of the country in the middle of the province, and forced the clan of *Dergtind* or descendants of *Eber* into the southwest of Cork and Kerry. From their peculiar position in the south they must have acknowledged the supremacy of Tuathal and his successors.

In the reign of *Cond*, surnamed of the Hundred Battles, grandson of

¹ The *Aithech Tuatha*, or servile tribes, have been identified by some antiquarians with the British tribes known as *Atticotti*. There is nothing improbable in the notion that when beaten they may have crossed over to Britain, where they became known as *Atticotti*, and were associated with the *Scots* in their devastations of the Roman provinces.

[ca. 160-254 A.D.]

Tuathal, the clan of Degaid had succeeded in getting the upper hand of the clans both of Eber and Lugaid; and Munster, now divided into three petty kingdoms, was ruled over by three princes of that family. A chief of the Eberians named Eogan, better known as Mug Nuadat, by the aid of his foster-father the king of Leinster, succeeded in defeating the Degaidian princes and driving them out of Munster. The latter asked the aid of Cond the over-king, who took up their cause, and a fierce war arose, in which Cond was beaten and compelled to divide Ireland with his rival. The boundary line ran from the Bay of Galway to Dublin along the great ridge of gravel which stretches across Ireland. The northern part was Leth Cuind or Cond's Half, and the southern part Leth Moga or Mug's Half. By this arrangement the present county of Clare, which had hitherto belonged to Olinegmacht, was transferred to Munster, to which it has ever since belonged.

It was about this time too that the former province received the name Connacht, now Connaught, from the name of King Cond. In the wars between Mug Nuadat and Cond a considerable number of foreigners are said to have been in the army of the former, among whom are specially named Spaniards. Perhaps these foreigners represent the tribe of Lugaid, and this was really the period of the arrival of that tribe in Ireland out of which grew the Milesian story. The earliest of the Ogam inscriptions are perhaps of this date, and support the view just stated.

Mug Nuadat must have been an able man, for he established his race so firmly that his descendants ruled Munster for a thousand years. He seems to have been as politic as warlike, for we are told he stored corn to save his people from famine. He was also enabled to give some to many chieftains who in a tribal community had no such forethought, and thus made them his vassals. His success, however, created a rivalry which lasted down to the final overthrow of the native government, and led to constant war and devastation, and mainly contributed to the final overthrow of the central monarchy. Although Munster remained nominally in subjection to that power, it was thenceforward in reality an independent kingdom, or rather federation of clans under the king of Cashel.

If the Scots failed to subdue the south thoroughly, they succeeded in crushing the Ultonians, and driving them ultimately into the southeastern corner of the province. One of Cond's successors, Fiacha Srabtaine, was slain by his nephews, known as the three Collas. Finding an excuse in an insult offered to their grandfather, King Cormac, son of Art, they invaded Ulster, plundered and burned Emain Macha, the ancient seat of the kings of the Ultonians, and made "sword-land" of a large part of the kingdom, which was afterwards known as Airgeill or Oriel. Afterwards the sons of the celebrated Niall of the Nine Hostages, the most powerful monarch of the Scotie dynasty after Tuathal, also carved out principalities for themselves in Ulster which bore their names for centuries: Tir Conaill, or as it was called in English Tyrconnel, the land of Conall, and Tir Eogain, the land of Eogan, from which has come the name of one of the Ulster counties, Tyrone.

INVASIONS OF BRITAIN BY THE IRISH

Constant allusions are made in the legends of the prehistoric kings to warlike expeditions to Alba. The *Annals of the Four Masters*,^h quoting the *Annals of Tigernach*, tell us at the year 240 that Cormac, son of Art and grandson of Cond, sailed across the sea and obtained the sovereignty of Alba. This Cormac was a noteworthy king, who ruled with much state at Tara from about

[354-405 A.D.]

254 to 277 A.D. He is said to have introduced water-mills into Ireland, and to have established schools for the study of law, military matters, and the annals of the country. Laws attributed to him continued in force all through the Middle Ages. It was, however, during the reign of Crimthand son of Fidach (366-379) and of his successor Niall of the Nine Hostages (379-405) that the Irish invasions of Britain acquired for the first time historic importance. The former was a Munster prince, the most powerful of his race, and the only Eberian prince who was king of Ireland until Brian Boruma (1002). His successor Niall was also the most powerful of the rival race of the Erimonian Scots.

There appear to have been three distinct settlements of Irish tribes in Britain: (1) of Munster tribes in South Wales, Devonshire, and Cornwall; (2) of Erimonian Scots in the Isle of Man, Anglesey, and other parts of Gwynedd



ROCK OF CASHEL

or North Wales; and (3) of the Erimonian Scots, called the Dal-Riada. The Cruithni or Picts of Galloway seem to have been a fourth settlement, but definite evidence on this point is wanting. The first invasion and the extent of the settlement of the Irish in southwest Britain are established by the Ogam inscriptions.

Early writers pointed out a Goidelic element in the topographical nomenclature of west Britain, and concluded that the country was once occupied by the Goedel, whence they were driven into Ireland by the advancing Cymri. This was a natural and reasonable conclusion at the time. But our present knowledge compels us to adopt a different view, namely, that without prejudice to the existence at an anterior period of Goidelic tribes in west Britain, the numerous traces of Goidelic names found there are derived from an Irish occupation in historic times.

The Rev. W. Basil Jones,^d bishop of St. Davids, who by his valuable book, *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd* (North Wales), has so largely contributed to our knowledge of this subject, came to the conclusion that the Irish occupied the whole of Anglesey, Carnarvon, Merioneth, and Cardiganshire, with a portion at least of Denbighshire, Montgomeryshire, and Radnorshire. The same tribes who occupied Anglesey and Gwynedd also occupied the Isle of Man, which, as is well known, was an Irish possession before the Norse invasion. It would appear that the first occupation of Man, Mona, and Gwynedd took place before the dominance of the Scots, or was the work of Ultonians. But

[314-400 A.D.]

the Erimonian Scots were afterwards the dominant element. South Wales was undoubtedly occupied by south Munster tribes. The occupation of North Wales was probably due to a similar pressure of the Scots upon the Ultonians.

We have said that there was probably a fourth settlement of Irish in Britain, but that we had no definite information on the subject. The position of the Goidelic population in Galloway is, however, so peculiar that we have no hesitation in saying that it is derived from an emigration of Irish Cruithni or Picts in the first half of the fourth century, consequent on the Scotie invasion of Ulster. Bede^e is the earliest authority for such a migration. Speaking of the inhabitants of Britain he says: "In process of time Britain, besides the Britons and the Picts, received a third nation, the Scots, who migrating from Ireland under their leader Reuda, either by fair means or by force of arms secured to themselves those settlements among the Picts which they still possess. From the name of their commander they are to this day called Dalreudins; for in their language *dal* signifies a part." Bede derived his information from some of the Columban clergy, and knew nothing of Wales, and therefore of any previous settlements of the Irish. About three hundred years after the first settlement a body of the Irish Dalriads of Antrim went to Alba, under the leadership of Fergus Mor, son of Erc, and his brothers, and founded on the basis of the previous colony a new Dal Riata, which became known as Airer Goedel or region of the Gael, a name now pronounced Argyll. This petty kingdom ultimately developed into the kingdom of Scotland, and appropriated to itself the name of the mother country, or at least that which was its Latin name.

The Roman historians are usually assumed to represent that the Scots taking part in the attacks on Roman Britain all came like the Picts from the north. But Ammianus expressly states that the Picts, Atticotti, and Scots arrived by different ways (*per diversa vagantes*). The basis of the Scotie attacks was their settlements in Wales and southwest Britain, which afforded protection to the invading forces arriving from Ireland in their hide-covered wicker boats. Argyll may also have served as a point from which to send out piratical expeditions. The Irish Picts or Ultonians who had settled in Galloway must have also joined in the fray—their position near the Solway giving them unusual facilities.

CHRISTIANITY IN IRELAND

In the beginning of the fourth century there was an organised Christian church in Britain, for there were British bishops at the council of Arles in 314 A.D., one of whom was probably from Wales. At that time the Irish had possession of many places in west and south Britain, and must have come in contact with Christians. These were more numerous and the church was better organised in South Wales and southwest Britain, where the Munster or southern Irish were, than in North Wales, held by the Scots proper. Christianity may, therefore, have found its way into Munster some time in the fourth century. This would account for the existence of several Christian Scots before St. Patrick, such as Pelagius the heresiarch and his disciple Coelestius, one of whom was certainly a Scot, and Cælius Sedulius (in Irish, *Siadal*, or *Siudal*), the Christian poet, who flourished in Italy about the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century.

There is a story of four bishops who, with several priests and anchorites, lived in Munster before the mission of St. Patrick; but later inquiries have shown that most if not all these either were contemporaries of St. Patrick or

belonged to a later time. But, although it is almost certain that no organised church existed in Ireland before the mission of St. Patrick, there may have been several scattered communities in the south of Ireland.^b

We have evidence of the visit to Ireland of one Christian missionary before St. Patrick. This was Palladius. Just when he made his Irish visit is unknown, but he is mentioned in most of the old biographies of St. Patrick, where his mission is naturally spoken of as a comparative failure. The fact that he is sometimes called Palladius Patrick has led to his being often confused with the real Patrick whom he preceded. By most of the early writers he is said to have returned to Britain very shortly before Patrick set out for Ireland, but other accounts make him suffer martyrdom in that island.^a

The death of Palladius is assumed to have taken place in 431, and the mission of St. Patrick to have begun in the following year. Our knowledge of the Irish apostle is, however, so contradictory and unsatisfactory that no reliance can be placed on any dates connected with him. In any case, when we remember the time and the state of Europe, it is not at all likely that the place of Palladius could be so rapidly supplied as the above dates make out.^b Nor is there any certain information as to the birthplace of St. Patrick. Tradition tells us that he was born at "Nemthur," and it has been conjectured that "Nemthur" was a village near the Clyde end of the wall of Antoninus, probably on the site of the present Dumbarton. After the withdrawal of the Roman legions, Patrick's father, Calpornius, who was a deacon and magistrate and came of a noble family, probably retired for safety south of the wall of Severus, to the neighbourhood of "Bannavem Taberniæ," which can be only approximately located in the Clyde basin, near that river's mouth.

Our principal authority for the events of St. Patrick's early life is included in his *Confessio*, a spirited autobiography of singular interest, which together with his *Epistle* are, as Ramsay¹ points out, the earliest prose writings that can be attributed to a native of the British Islands. In his *Confessio* he tells us that with many others he was carried off at the age of sixteen from his father's farm at "Bannavem Taberniæ" and sold as a slave into Ireland. But although, as we have seen, Patrick came of a clerical and noble family, the events of his early life caused his education to be much neglected. For six years he tended sheep for an Irish chieftain in Antrim, and then escaped to Britain, and spent several years in preparing himself for missionary labours in Ireland, to which work he had determined to devote his life.^a

Although there is much obscurity and confusion in the life of St. Patrick, there cannot be the slightest doubt of his real existence. He was thoroughly acquainted with the people of Ireland, and consequently knew that he should secure the chief in order to succeed with the clan, and this is what he did.¹ At first the conversion was only apparent, but, although the mass of the people still continued practically pagans, the apostle was enabled to found churches and schools, and educate a priesthood, and thus provide the most effective and certain means of converting the whole people. He was undoubtedly a great missionary, full of zeal but withal prudent, and guided by much good sense.

It would be a mistake to suppose that his success was as rapid or as complete as is generally assumed. On the contrary, it is fully apparent that he had much hard work, and ran much danger, that many chiefs refused to hear him, and that much paganism still existed at his death. That this should

[¹ One of the stories told of St. Patrick is that he sought out the old Irish chief whose slave he had been, and recompensed him for the loss he had sustained in his escape by a payment of three times his value.]

[431-650 A.D.]

be so was no doubt an inherent defect of his system; but on the other hand, by no other system could so much real work have been done in so short a time, and that too, so far as we can make out, almost by his own unaided efforts

THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH

The church founded by St. Patrick was identical in doctrine with the churches of Britain and Gaul, and other branches of the western church. There is no evidence that the Pelagian heresy found an entrance there, and least of all is there the slightest foundation for the supposition that it had any connection with the eastern church. Its organisation was, however, peculiar; and, as countries in the tribal state of society are very tenacious of their customs, the Irish church preserved these peculiarities for a long time, and carried them into other countries, by which the Irish were brought into direct collision with a different and more advanced church organisation.

Wherever the Roman law and municipal institutions had been in force, the church society was modelled on the civil one. The bishops governed ecclesiastical districts co-ordinate with the civil divisions. In Ireland there were no cities and no municipal institutions; the nation consisted of groups of tribes connected by kinship and loosely held together under a graduated system of tribal government. The church which grew up under such a system was organised exactly like the lay society. When a chief became a Christian and bestowed his *dun* and his lands upon the church, he at the same time transferred all his rights as a chief. But though by his gift the chief divested himself of his rights, these still remained with his sept or clan, though subordinate to the uses of the church; at first all church offices were exclusively confined to members of the sept or of the clan, according as the gift emanated from the head of the one or the other.

In this new sept or clan there was consequently a twofold succession. The religious sept or family consisted, in the first instance, not only of the ecclesiastical persons to whom the gift was made, but of all the *celi*, or vassals, tenants, and slaves, connected with the land bestowed. The head was the *comarba*, that is, the co-heir, or inheritor both of the spiritual and temporal rights and privileges of the founder; he in his temporal capacity exacted rent and tribute like other chiefs, and made war not on temporal chiefs only—the spectacle of two *comarpi* making war on each other being not unusual.

The ecclesiastical colonies that went forth from a parent family generally remained in subordination to it in the same way that the spreading branches of a secular clan remained in general subordinate to it. The heads of the secondary families were also called the *comarpi* of the original founder of the religious clan. Thus there were *comarpi* of Columba at Hi (Iona), Kells, Durrow, Derry, and other places. The *comarba* of the chief family of a great spiritual clan was called the *ard-comarba* or high *comarba*. The *comarba* might be a bishop or only an abbot, but in either case all the ecclesiastics of the family were subject to him; in this way it frequently happened that bishops, though their superior functions were recognised, were in subjection to abbots, who were only priests, nay, even to a woman, as in the instance of St. Brigit.

This singular association of lay and spiritual powers was liable to the abuse of having the whole succession fall into lay hands, as happened to a large extent in later times. This has led to many misconceptions of the true character and discipline of the Irish mediæval church. The temporal chief had his steward who superintended the collection of his rents and tributes;

in like manner the comarba of a religious sept had his *airchinnech* (usually written in Anglo-Irish documents *erenach* and *herenach*), an office which has given rise to many erroneous views. The name was supposed to be a corruption of archidiaconus, but this is not so. The office of airchinnech or steward of church lands was generally but not necessarily hereditary; it embodied in a certain sense the lay succession in the family.

From the beginning the church of St. Patrick was monastic, as is proved by a passage in his *Confessio*, where, speaking of the success of his mission, he says: "The sons of Scots and daughters of chiefs appear now as monks and virgins of Christ." But the early Irish monasticism was unlike that known at a later period. An Irish cœnobium of the earliest type was simply an ordinary sept or family whose chief had become Christian, and making a gift of his land either retired leaving it in the hands of a comarba, or remained as the religious head himself. The family went on with their usual avocations, but some of the men and women, and in some cases all, practised celibacy, and all joined in fasting and prayer. These communities offer many striking analogies with the Shaker communities of the United States. A severer and more exclusive system of monasticism succeeded this primitive one, but its general character never entirely changed.

As all notions of diocesan jurisdiction as understood in countries under Roman law were unknown, there was not that limitation of the number of bishops which territorial jurisdiction renders necessary, and consequently bishops were very numerous. If we were to believe some of the legends of the early church, the bishops were nearly as numerous as the priests. St. Mochta, abbot of Lugmad, or Louth, and said to have been a disciple of St. Patrick, had one hundred bishops in his monastic family. All the bishops in a cœnobium were, as we have said above, subject to the abbot. Besides the bishops in the monastic families, every tuath or tribe had its own bishop.

The church in Ireland having been evolved out of the monastic *nuclei* above described, the tribe-bishop was an episcopal development of a somewhat later period. He was an important personage, having a right to the same retinue as the *ri* or chief, and though we cannot define exactly the character of his jurisdiction, which extended over the tuath, his power was considerable, as we can judge by the conflicts which took place between them and the kings on that fertile source of dissension, the right of sanctuary. The tuath bishop corresponded to the diocesan bishop as closely as it was possible in the two systems so different as tribal and municipal government. When diocesan jurisdiction grew up in Ireland in the twelfth and subsequent centuries, the tuath became a diocese.

In the eighth and ninth centuries, when the great emigration of Irish scholars and ecclesiastics took place, the number of wandering bishops without dioceses became a reproach to the Irish church, and there can be no doubt that it led to much inconvenience and abuse, and was subversive of the stricter discipline that the popes had succeeded in establishing in the western church. They were also accused of ordaining serfs without the consent of their lord, consecrating bishops *per saltum*, that is, making persons bishops who had not previously received the orders of priests, and of permitting bishops to be consecrated by a single bishop. The latter could hardly be a reproach to the Irish church, as the practice was never held to be invalid. The isolated position of Ireland, and the existence of tribal organisation in full vigour, explain fully the anomalies of Irish discipline, many of which were also survivals of the early Christian practices before the complete organisation of the church.

[550-650 A.D.]

From the nature of the organisation of the Irish church as established by St. Patrick, it was to be expected that on his death the bond between the numerous church families which his great authority supplied would be greatly relaxed. The druidic orders, too, which there is reason to believe remained still to a large extent pagan, and undoubtedly practised many of their arts even in the seventh century, must have regained much of their old power. A tradition exists that at the instance of St. Patrick the laws were purified by a commission of which he himself was a member, and collected into a body called the *Senchas Mor*. Nevertheless, the pagan marriage customs were practised long after St. Patrick's time.

The transition period which follows the loosening of the faith of a people in its old religion, and before the authority of the new is universally accepted, is always a time of confusion and relaxation of morals. Such a period appears to have followed in the first half of the sixth century the fervour of St. Patrick's time. This period of reaction after warlike and religious excitement has been magnified into an entire corruption of faith and morals, for which, however, there is no real evidence. That the survival of the druids under the name of the grades or orders of *Ecna* and *Filidecht*, which we may describe conventionally as bards, had much to do with the state of disorder we are discussing, is proved by the proposal of the king Aed (572-599), son of Ainmire, to get rid of them on account of their numbers and unreasonable and exorbitant demands. St. Columba, however, advocated and secured a reform of the body, a diminution of their number, and the curtailment of their privileges.

The encroachments of the Saxons which forced the Cymri of the north into Wales, and the consequent driving out of the Irish from their possessions in Wales and southwest Britain, and the desolation and anarchy of the whole country, appear to have caused many British ecclesiastics to seek a refuge in Ireland, among whom was Gildas, who is said to have been invited over by King Ainmire. But, whether as an invited guest or as a refugee, Gildas certainly helped to reform the Irish church, at least of Leth Cuind, or Cond's Half. The chief reform due to the influence of Gildas and the British church seems to have been the introduction of monastic life in the strict sense of the word, that is, of communities entirely separated from the laity, with complete separation of the sexes.

To this reformed church of the second half of the sixth century and early part of the seventh belong Columba, Comgall, and many other saints of renown, who established the schools from which went forth the missionaries and scholars who made the name of Scot and of Ireland so well known throughout Europe. During this period the energy of the youth of Ireland seems to have concentrated itself on religious asceticism and missionary work. St. Columba converted the Picts, and from his monastery of Hi (Iona) went forth the illustrious Aedan to plant another Iona at Lindisfarne, which, as Mr. Hill Burton,⁹ the historian of Scotland, says, "long after the poor parent brotherhood had fallen to decay, expanded itself into the bishopric of Durham or, as some will have it, the archbishopric of York itself; for of all the Christian missions to England that of Aedan seems to have taken the firmest root."

This was also the period of the great missionaries of the Continent, Columbanus, Gall, Killian, and many others. Nor had the old daring on the sea—which distinguished the Scotie adventurers who had ravaged the coasts of Britain—died out among the Gael of south Munster, for besides St. Brendan, whose voyages have given rise to a widespread myth, there was another navigator, Cormac, a disciple of St. Columba, who visited the Orkneys, and discovered the Faroe Islands and Iceland, long before the Northmen set foot

on them. Other Irishmen followed in their tracks, and when the Northmen first discovered Iceland they found there books and other traces of the Irish of the early church.

The peculiarities which, owing to Ireland's isolation, had survived were, as we have said, brought into prominence when the Irish missionaries came into contact with Roman ecclesiastics. Those peculiarities, though only survivals of customs once general in the Christian church, shocked the ecclesiastics of the Roman school, accustomed to the order and discipline which were everywhere being introduced into the western church. On the Easter question especially a contest arose which waxed hottest in England; and as the Irish monks stubbornly adhered to their traditions they were vehemently attacked by their opponents. This controversy occupies much space in the history of the western church, and led to an unequal struggle between the Roman and Scotie clergy in Scotland, England, the east of France, Switzerland, and a considerable part of Germany, which naturally ended in the Irish system giving way before the Roman. The monasteries following the Irish rule were supplanted by or converted into Benedictine ones.

Owing to this struggle the real work of the early Irish missionaries in converting the pagans of Britain and central Europe, and sowing the seeds of culture there, has been overlooked when not wilfully misrepresented. Thus, while the real work of the conversion of the pagan Germans was the work of Irishmen, Winifred or, as he is better known, St. Boniface, a man of great political ability, reaped the field they had sown, and is called the apostle of Germany, though it is very doubtful if he ever preached to the heathen. The southern Irish, who had been more in contact with the south British and Gauls, were the first to accept the Roman method of reckoning Easter, which they did in 633 A.D. In the north of Ireland, which was in connection with the Columban church, it was adopted fully only on the community of Iona yielding in 716, one hundred and fifty years after the commencement of the controversy.

THE DYNASTY OF THE HUI NEILL

Niall of the Nine Hostages had many sons, of whom eight became stem-fathers of important clans. Four—Loegaire, Conall Crimthand, Fiacc, and Maine—settled in Meath and adjoining territories, and their posterity were called the southern Hui or Hy Neill. The other four—Eogan, Enna Find, Cairpre, and Conall Gulban—like the three Collas before mentioned, went into Ulster and made sword-land of a large part of it. Their descendants were the northern Hui Neill. The territory of Eogan was known as Tir Eogain, which has survived in the county of Tyrone; that of Conall Gulban was called Tir Conaill (Tyr Connell), corresponding nearly to the present county of Donegal. The posterity of Eogan were the O'Neills and their numerous kindred septs; the posterity of Conall Gulban were the O'Donnells and their kindred septs. Loegaire, the son of Niall, was succeeded by Ailill Molt, the son of Niall's predecessor Dathi. After a reign of twenty years (463-483) he was slain in the battle of Ocha by Lugaid, son of Loegaire. This battle marks an epoch in Irish history, for it made the posterity of Niall the dominant race in Ireland for five hundred years, during which the Hui Néill held the kingship without a break. The power of the Hui Neill over Munster, or, indeed, over any part of Mug's Half, which included Leinster, was, however, often only nominal.

The first king of the southern Hui Neill was Dermot, son of Fergus Mac

[538-559 A. D.]

Cerbaill (538-558). He undoubtedly professed Christianity, but still clung to many pagan practices, such as a plurality of wives and the use of druidical incantations in battle. He quarrelled with the church about the right of sanctuary, with disastrous results for the country. The king held an assembly of the kings and princes of Ireland at Tara in 554, at which Curnan, son of the king of Connaught, slew a nobleman. By ancient usage homicide and certain other offences committed at such assemblies were punishable with death without the privilege of compounding for the crime. Curnan, knowing his fate, fled for sanctuary to Columba; but Dermot pursued him, and, disregarding the opposition of the saint, seized Curnan and hanged him.

The kinsmen of Columba, the northern Hui Neill, took up his quarrel, and attacked and defeated the king in a battle in 555. It is probable that the part taken by Columba in this affair had much to do with his leaving Ireland for his great mission to the Picts two years after. So ardent, energetic, and imperious a spirit must have chafed at any impediment in the way of his work, and, as many of his establishments were under the king's hand, he must have decided to seek another field. After the death of Dermot, who was slain in 558, Tara was deserted, and no assembly was again held there. Subsequent kings resided at their hereditary duns—the northern Hui Neill at Ailech, near Derry, those of the southern branch in Westmeath. The desertion of Tara was one of the chief causes which disintegrated the Irish nation, in which the idea of a central government had taken firm root, and might under favourable circumstances have acquired sufficient force to evolve a higher political state out of the tribal system.

The Reign of Aed

The reign of Aed, son of Ainmire, of the race of Conall Gulban of the northern Hui Néill (572-599), marks another important epoch in Irish history. The bards (*fili*), who were part of the transformed druidic order, had increased in number to such an extent that they are said to have included one-third of the freemen. An *ollam fili*, the highest grade of the order, was entitled to a large retinue of pupils, with their horses and dogs, with free quarters wherever he went. There was thus quite an army of impudent swaggering idlers roaming about the country and quartering themselves on the chiefs and nobles during the winter and spring, story-telling, and lampooning those who dared to refuse, or even to hesitate, to comply with their demands. Aed determined to banish them from Ireland; and, as this could only be done with the consent and co-operation of all the kings and chiefs, he summoned a convention, such as formerly met at Tara, to assemble at Druimceta, in the north of Ireland.

Two other causes were also to be discussed at the assembly, one of which is of considerable historic interest, namely, Aed's proposal to impose a tribute payable to the over-king upon the Dalriadic kingdom in Alba, which had hitherto paid no rent, though bound to assist the Irish king in his wars both by sea and land, and to pay him *erics* or blood fines. In other words, Aed proposed to make the Dalriadic colony an integral part of the Irish kingdom. St. Columba came thither from his island home attended by a large retinue of monks, many of whom were bishops, to plead the cause of the bards and of his kinsman Aedan of the Dalriads.

His influence seems to have been decisive; the bards were not banished, but were reformed, and the Dalriadic colony was made independent. The decision about the bards was no doubt a reasonable compromise at the time.

The schools which the reformed order were obliged to keep mainly contributed to make Ireland a refuge of learning in the seventh and eighth centuries, and created a native literature, such as it was, several centuries before those of the other barbarian nations of Europe. But on the other hand, professional poets, whose duty it was to sound the praises of chiefs and clans in rhymes of the most complex and artificial metres and inflated language, could not produce a really healthy vigorous literature.

We are, however, now in a better position to judge of the injurious action of the bardic institution as a whole. Several causes—among others, geographical position—helped to arrest the political and social growth of the Irish people, and crystallise their culture in the tribal stage, but the most powerful of those causes was the existence of the organised professions of the *suide*, who kept up elaborate systems of pedigrees, and of the *filid* or bards, whose business it was to flatter the vanity of their patrons and pander to their vices. These kept the clan spirit alive, shut out the influx of new opinions, and stopped



ST. COLUMBA CHURCH AND TOWER

the growth of national political ideas. The ephemeral lustre of the Irish mediæval schools could never compensate for such losses.

Joint kingship was one of the most curious features of the Irish system; it frequently occurred in the course of the Hui Neill rule. Later in the seventh century (681) the cow-tribute or *boroim* of Leinster was abolished at the instance of St. Moling by the over-king Finnachta; and at the end of it (697) St. Adamnan, abbot of Hi (Iona) who had come to Ireland in connection with the still unsettled question of the time of keeping Easter, succeeded in exempting women from military service. The necessity for such a law, which has been called from its author the *Cain Adamnain*, shows how little affected the tribal system of Ireland was by Roman civilisation even at this period.

In the reign of the over-king Aed Alaind (733-742), an attempt seems to have been made for the first time to create a national church organisation. King Aed and his rival, the king of Munster, Cathal, entered into an agreement regulating the tribute due to the church according to the rules and customs of the see of Armagh. Some time elapsed, however, before the regulation was generally accepted over the whole of Ireland. In the year 803 the over-king Aed Ordngthe mustered an army composed of "both laity and clergy," but the latter complained of the hardship of being forced to take part in warlike expeditions. King Aed agreed to abide by the advice of a learned priest called Fothud of the Canons, who recommended the exemption

[705-850 A.D.]

of the clergy from the obligation of fighting. This law was called the *Cain Patraicc* or law of Patrick, probably from having been obtained by the comarba or successor of St. Patrick, that is, the archbishop of Armagh at the time. The exemption may have, however, formed part of the regulations, called also *Cain Patraicc*, which formed the subject of the agreement between Aed Alaind and Cathal above referred to.

THE INVASION OF THE NORTHMEN

The first incursion of the Northmen took place in 795 A.D., when they plundered and burned the church of Rechrann, now Lambey, an island north of Dublin Bay. When this event occurred, the power of the over-king had become a shadow; the provincial kingdom had split up into more or less independent principalities, almost constantly at war with each other. Even Mag Breg, which was only part of Meath, was able to rebel against the chief of the latter. The oscillation of the centre of power between Meath and Derry, according as the over-king was of the southern or northern Hui Neill, which followed the desertion of Tara, produced corresponding perturbations in the balance of parties among the minor kings.

The army consisted of a number of clans, each commanded by its own chief, and acting as so many independent units without cohesion. The clansmen owed fealty only to their chiefs, who in turn owed a kind of conditional allegiance to the over-king, depending a good deal upon the ability of the latter to enforce it. A chief might through pique, or from other causes, withdraw his clan even on the eve of a battle, without such defection being deemed dishonourable. What the clan was to the nation or the province, the fine or sept was to the clan itself. The chieftains or heads of septs had a voice, not only in the question of war or peace, for that was determined by the whole clan, but in all subsequent operations. However brave the individual soldiers of such an army might be, the army itself was unreliable against a well-organised and disciplined enemy. Again, such clan armies were only levies gathered together for a few weeks at most, unprovided with military stores or the means of transport, and consequently generally unprepared to attack fortifications of any kind, and liable to melt away as quickly as they were gathered together. Admirably adapted for a sudden attack, such an army was wholly unfit to carry on a regular campaign or take advantage of a victory. These defects of the Irish military system were abundantly shown throughout the Dano-Irish wars, and also in Anglo-Norman times.

The first invaders were Norwegians, who sought only plunder and captives. They confined their attacks to the sea-coast, or places at easy distances from it. After some time they erected rude earthen or stockaded forts, which served as magazines and places of retreat. Some served a temporary purpose, while others became in time trading stations, or grew into towns. During the first half of the ninth century the attacks were incessant upon almost every part of the coast. The small bodies who came at first having met with considerable resistance, large fleets commanded by powerful vikings followed. Their well-armed crews—the principal men at least being mail-clad—were able to penetrate into the country, and even to put fleets of boats upon the lakes.

An Irish work on the invasions of the Northmen gives an account of one of those vikings named Turges or Turgesius, of whose cruelties many stories are told. Giraldus Cambrensis¹ and the monk Jocelin^m repeated these stories—the Irish book being, however, the original source from which the

[815-845 A.D.]

stories came. But Cambrensis goes beyond his source, and makes Turgesius king of Ireland. The Norse saga and chronicles make no mention of Turges, and much speculation has been indulged in as to the Norse equivalent of the name. It has been suggested that he was Thorgils, son of Harold Fair Hair, but this is an anachronism. According to another view, he was the shadowy king Ragnar Lodbrok or Hairy Breeches, but this, besides being also an anachronism, is mere groundless guesswork. Dr. Todd has suggested that the Celtic form Turges represents the Norse *Trygve*, but is more likely *Thorgeir*.

The actual story of Turges is a fable, which has grown up by the fusion of the stories of several vikings of the name, helped out by some invention. The Turges of history is supposed to have come to Ireland in 815, and to have been made prisoner and drowned by Malachy, the first king of the name in 845. Garmundus, another king of Ireland spoken of by Cambrensis⁷ and Jocelin,⁸ is most probably the mythical Garman or Carman of prehistoric



CLONMACNOISE, IRELAND

times, a view which bears out a sagacious remark of Worsaae,⁹ that the Irish accounts of the Northmen frequently bear the stamp of being derived from early poetical legends.

But, even admitting that the story of Turges is a fable, the viking inroads in the first half of the ninth century inflicted untold woes on the country, one of the greatest being the breaking up of the Irish schools, just when they were at their best. Those who escaped fled to other countries; among these we may assume were Sedulius Scotus and John Scotus Erigena. But, whatever may have been the cruelty of the vikings, the work of disorder and ruin was not all theirs. The condition of the country afforded full scope for the jealousy, hatred, cupidity, and vanity which characterise the tribal stage of political society.

Fedlimid, king of Munster and archbishop of Cashel, took the opportunity of the misfortunes of the country to revive the claims of the Munster dynasty to be kings of Ireland. To enforce this claim he ravaged and plundered a large part of the country, took hostages from Niall Caille, the over-king (833-845), drove out the comarba of St. Patrick, or archbishop of Armagh, and for a whole year occupied his place as bishop. On his return he plundered the termon lands of Clonmacnoise "up to the church door"—an exploit he repeated the following year. There is no mention of his having helped to drive out the foreigners. It is indeed possible that much of the devastation at-

[852 A.D.]

tributed to Turges may have been the work of Fedlimid, yet he is praised by the bards and annalists.^b

When we consider the energy of the Norse, their superior equipment and experience in war, and the dissensions which continually raged among the native chiefs, it may seem strange that the Celtic population did not succumb, and Ireland suffer the fate of the Western Isles. But a nation organised upon the tribal system, and inhabiting a country of sufficient extent, is equally incapable of resistance and conquest. The invaders arriving upon any point of the coast meet with a feeble and ill-conducted resistance from the local chieftain; but the defeated tribe, though perhaps crippled and pillaged, retires as unbroken in organisation as a regular army into its natural fastnesses.

As the invaders advance, a similar resistance encounters them in each successive district. Their forces waste in continually renewed and indecisive battles. There is no capital, where the government of the natives is concentrated, which may be captured, and the natural resistance thereby paralysed. The natives of the country do not gather of one accord into a body, and stake their freedom on the issue of a single decisive engagement. As the invaders traverse the country, they are exhausted by fruitless combats and dispirited by a prolonged resistance, which could not have been reasonably expected, while their communications are ever cut off by enemies, who, although defeated, yet close upon their rear like water. The strength for resistance in a nation so organised arises from its political disorganisation. Like an animal of the lower order, it may be stabbed again and again, without a mortal wound being inflicted.^f

THE SCANDINAVIAN SETTLEMENTS

About 852 the Dub-gaill or black foreigners, that is the Danes as distinguished from the Find-gaill or fair foreigners or Norwegians, arrived. They quarrelled with each other at first, but ultimately made common cause. The Scandinavians at this time had effected permanent settlements, and trade had brought the natives and foreigners into friendly contact and intermarriage. Much intermingling of blood had already taken place in consequence of the number of captive women who had been carried away by the invaders. A mixed race grew up, recruited by many Irish of pure blood, whom a love of adventure and a lawless spirit led away. This heterogeneous population were called Gallgoedel or foreign Irish, and like their northern kinsmen betook themselves to the sea and practised piracy, and so were known to the Northmen as Vikingr Scotar.

The Christian element in this mixed society soon lapsed to a large extent, if not entirely, into paganism. The Scandinavian settlements were almost wholly confined to the seaport towns, and, except Dublin, included none of the surrounding territory. Owing to its position, and the character of the country about it, especially the coast land to the north of the Liffey, which formed a kind of border land between the territories of the kings of Meath and Leinster, a considerable tract passed into the possession of so powerful a city as Dublin.¹ We have evidence of this occupation in the topographical nomenclature of the district, while there are very few traces to be found elsewhere.

¹ In Anglo-Norman times the Dano-Irish of Dublin and other cities are always called Ostmen (Aust-menn) or East men; hence the name Ostmanstown, now Oxmanstown, a part of the city of Dublin.

The social and political condition of Ireland, and the pastoral occupation of the inhabitants, were unfavourable to the development of foreign commerce, and the absence of coined money among them shows that it did not exist. The foreign articles of dress or ornament they required appear to have been brought to the great *oenachs* or fairs held periodically in various parts of the country. A flourishing commerce soon grew up in the Scandinavian towns—Dublin, Waterford, Limerick, etc.; mints were established there, and many foreign traders—Flemings, Italians, and others—settled there. It was through these Scandinavian trading communities that Ireland came into contact with the rest of Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The settlers in the Scandinavian towns soon came to be looked upon by the native Irish as so many septs of a clan added to the system of petty states forming the Irish political system. They soon mixed themselves up in the domestic quarrels of neighbouring tribes, at first selling their protection, a method largely followed afterwards by the Anglo-Normans, but afterwards as vassals, sometimes as allies. The native Irish in turn acted in similar capacities with the powerful Dano-Irish chiefs, Irish clans often forming part of the Scandinavian armies in Britain. This intercourse led to frequent intermarriage between the chiefs and nobility of the two peoples.

After the arrival of the Danes, about 851, there was a severe struggle between them and the Norwegians, but all ultimately acknowledged Olaf the White as king. The over-king of Ireland at this time was Malachy, the first of the name, a brave soldier who had reduced the Scandinavian possessions in Ireland previous to the coming of Olaf to a few strongholds on the sea; but owing to the character of the Irish armies, which has been dwelt upon above, he was unable to retain the forts he took (among them Dublin).^b

The establishments of the Danes might have had a favourable effect upon the condition of the island; they produced no such results. They rather aggravated the civil dissensions and ultimately proved the obstacle to the consolidation of Ireland into a national monarchy. They were not sufficiently wealthy and powerful to command respect. Their civilisation was not conspicuously superior to that of the natives, and the paganism still retained by the Danes deprived them of all moral influence among a people of less political vigour, but professing a purer creed. Their utmost efforts could not do more than secure the district immediately about their homes; and they effected this by playing off the Irish chiefs against each other—joining with them successively in temporary alliances, and always uniting against that chief whose power inspired them with most apprehension. Thus these cities formed constant centres of disturbance, and were even enlisted on the side of anarchy and disorder. For nearly two centuries such was the history of Ireland.^f

Toward the end of the ninth century there came a lull in the activities of the Danes, and for the space of forty years Ireland was free from outside attack. But the hostility among the native tribes was as rife as ever. In 919 the over-king Niall Blackknee attempted to take Dublin, but was repulsed and slain. Sixty years of the utmost confusion followed. The most prominent figure of the period was Murtough MacNeill, known as Leather Cloaks, son of Niall Blackknee, who proved the most formidable opponent the Scandinavians had yet met. His son, Domnall, was the first to use the surname O'Neill—that is grandson of Niall. In 980 Malachy II, who had already distinguished himself in the Dano-Irish wars as king of Meath, became over-king. He was the last of the Hui Neill who was undisputed king of Ireland. In the first year of his reign as over-king Malachy defeated severely the Dano-Irish under

[950-981 A.D.]

Olaf Cuaran, king of Dublin, at Tara. Olaf, broken-hearted over his defeat and the death of his son Rögnvald, went on a pilgrimage to Iona, and died there in the following year.^a

THE DAL-CAIS DYNASTY

Towards the end of the tenth century it at last seemed that the long-afflicted nation had found a saviour in the person of Brian Boruma, the only Irish king who has acquired a position in European history. At this time the Danes of Limerick, largely reinforced by fresh arrivals, attempted the conquest of Munster. The event is thus described by an old Irish historian (*Wars of the Gaels with the Galls*): "There came after that an immensely great fleet, with Imar, the grandson of Imar, the chief king of the foreigners, and with his three sons. They landed and encamped near the harbour of Limerick. Munster was plundered and ravaged on all sides by them, and they levied pledges and hostages from all the men of Munster. They brought them, under indecribable oppression, to the foreigner and the Dane. Moreover, he ordained kings and chiefs, stewards and bailiffs in every territory, and after that in every chieftaincy, and he levied the royal rent. And such was the oppressiveness of the tribute that there was a king from among the foreigners over every territory, a chief over every chieftaincy, an abbot over every church, a steward over every village, and a soldier in every house. So that none of the men of Erin had power to give even the milk of his cow, nor so much as the clutch of eggs of one hen in succour to the aged or a friend, but was forced to preserve them for the foreigner; and, though there were but one milk-giving cow in the house, she durst not be milked, but kept for the foreigner; and, however long absent he might be, his share durst not be lessened. Although there was in the house but one cow, it must be killed for the meal of one night, if the means of supply could not be otherwise obtained; and the tribute of an ounce of silver was paid for every head, and he who had not the means to pay himself went into slavery. No Irish chief was able to give them deliverance from the foreigner, because of the excellence of their armour, the greatness of their achievements, their strength and valour, and the excess of their thirst for the fruitful, grassy lands of Erin."^f

Like the Hui Neill, the rival family of Ailill Olum of Munster had split into two branches. The descendants of Ailill's son Eogan were called the Eoganacht or Eugenians, and those of his son Cormac the Dal-Cais. Ailill is said to have ordained that the succession to the throne of Munster should be alternately in the races of Eogan and Cormac Cas. This rule was observed with tolerable regularity for some generations, like the corresponding alter-



KING CORMAC'S CHAPEL, CASHEL

nation between the northern and southern Hui Neill. The Eugenician clans, however, being the more powerful, succeeded in excluding to a great extent the rival race from the throne. The Dal-Cais, who were seated in north Munster, had necessarily to bear the brunt of the attacks upon Munster, which impoverished and weakened them. A few of them succeeded, however, in asserting their claims to the throne, among whom were Kennedy (in 954) and his sons, Mathgamain, or Mahon (slain 976), and Brian, surnamed Boruma, who reigned over Munster from 976 to 1002, when he became over-king. Properly speaking, the Dal-Cais derived their name not directly from Cormac Cas but from Cas MacTail, king of Thomond, one of his descendants. The grandson of this Cas, Carthann Find, was the first Christian chieftain of the race. The family was seated near Bel na Boruma, or the Pass of the Cow-tribute, and Ath na Boruma, or Ford of the Tribute, which suggests that the Dal-Cais were in the habit of "lifting" preys of cattle. It was most probably from this place that Brian was called Boruma, and not, as is usually assumed, from having reimposed the ancient cow-tribute upon Leinster.^b

MATHGAMAIN AND BRIAN

The two brothers, Mathgamain and Brian, refusing to submit to the foreigner, carried off their people and their chattels over the Shannon westwards, and for some time carried on a merciless guerilla warfare. At length, both parties being thoroughly tired of each other, a peace was made between Mathgamain and the chieftains of the foreigners. But the younger and more determined brother, refusing to make peace, betook himself to the forests of north Munster. In the prolonged contest which ensued he and his followers suffered severely, and the foreigners cut off his people, so that he had no more than fifteen. Compassionating his brother's misfortunes, Mathgamain opened communications with him. In a conference between them, Brian fiercely told his more yielding brother that he should not speak of submission, "because it was hereditary for him to die, and hereditary for all the Dal-Cais, for their fathers and grandfathers had died, and death was certain; but it was not hereditary to submit, for their fathers had not submitted to any one on earth. It was no honour to their courage to abandon, without battle or conflict, to dark foreigners and dark, grim gentiles the inheritance their fathers and grandfathers had defended in battles against the chiefs of the Gaedhil." Thereupon the tribe of the Dal-Cais were assembled before Mathgamain, and he appealed to them whether they would have peace or war. With one voice, young and old, they answered that they preferred death in defending the freedom of their patrimony to submission to the tyranny of the pirates; "and this was the voice of hundreds as the voice of one." It was arranged that they should rally for battle on their original tribe land, "for it was better and more righteous to do battle for their inheritance than for land usurped by conquest and the sword."

In 968 A.D. a decisive battle was fought between the Danes of Limerick and the Dal-Cais at Sulcoit, near the town of Tipperary. The Danes were utterly routed, and the city of Limerick captured. "They followed them also into the fort, and slaughtered them in the streets and houses, and the fort was sacked by them after that. They carried off their jewels and their best property, their saddles, their gold, their silver, their beautiful woven cloth of various colours, their satins and silken cloth; they carried away their girls, their silk-clad women, their boys. The fort in the good town they reduced to a cloud of smoke. The whole of the captives were collected on the hills of

[968-1002 A.D.]

Saingel. Every one that was fit for war was killed, and every one that was fit for a slave was enslaved."

Mathgamain now established himself upon the throne of Munster. He had broken the power of the Danes in Limerick, and took hostages from the rival chieftains of his own race, and reigned without dispute for about six years. He was subsequently treacherously slain by a conspiracy of the tribal chiefs.

BRIAN, THE KING OF ALL IRELAND

Brian succeeded to his brother, and reduced Munster to complete obedience. He took hostages not only from the chiefs of that district, but also of the churches, lest they should receive rebels or thieves to sanctuary. Thus early in his career Brian exhibited his determination to maintain order and administer justice.

Ossory was next subdued, and at Magh Ailbhe he received the homage of the kings of Leinster. This was 984 A.D., and subsequently Brian assumed to act as the supreme king of Ireland. In 1000 A.D. the Leinster men revolted, and made an alliance with the Dublin Danes, who were naturally anxious to prevent the establishment of a vigorous national monarchy. On the advance of Brian the Leinster men sent their cattle and families into the territory of the Dublin Danes, and the allied forces advanced to meet the king. The celebrated battle, which finally established Brian upon the throne of Ireland, took place at Glen Mama, near Dunlavin, in the county Wicklow. The Danish forces were entirely defeated. The remnants of the beaten army fled to Hollywood, thence to the Horse-pass ford on the Liffey, above Poulaphouca, where they were again routed. Maelmorda, king of Leinster, was captured concealed in a yew tree near Hollywood, from which he was dragged by Murcadh, the son of Brian.

Dublin is stated to have been captured and plundered, though perhaps we may doubt this statement of the Irish annalists. The foreigners were, however, for the time reduced to subjection. "Ill-luck was it for the foreigners when Brian was born, for it was by him they were destroyed and enslaved. There was not a winnowing sheet from Howth to Kerry that had not a foreigner in bondage, nor was there a mill without a foreign woman. No son of a soldier or officer of the Gaedhil deigned to put his hand to a flail or any other labour, nor did a woman deign to put her hands to the grinding mill or to wash her clothes, but had a foreign man or woman to work for them."

Brian was now undisputed master of Ireland, king, not by hereditary right or popular election, but a king in a higher sense as possessing supreme power, which he yielded for the maintenance of justice and law. He may be called a usurper, but he was (like Cromwell) a usurper far superior to a mere king. Malachy II of Meath, the titular king of the sacred race, submitted without a struggle, and assumed a position subordinate to the real ruler.

For several years Ireland was firmly governed by this self-appointed sovereign, and there was no question as to the excellence of his government. "By him were erected in Erin noble churches and their sanctuaries. He sent professors and masters to teach wisdom and knowledge, and to buy books beyond the sea and the great ocean, because the writings and books in every church and sanctuary had been destroyed by the plunderers; and Brian himself gave the price of learning and the price of books to every one separately who went on this service. Many churches were built and repaired by him, bridges and roads were made, the fortresses of Munster were strengthened.

[1003-1014 A.D.]

He continued in this way prosperous, peaceful, hospitable, just-judging, venerated, with law and rule among the clergy, with honour and renown among the laity; powerful, secure for fifteen years in the chief sovereignty of Erin."

A truly national government of this description found its bitterest enemies among the provincial chiefs, who longed to restore anarchy, and were willing to league with the foreigner for that purpose. It required years of stern restraint to crush local tyrants into obedient nobles; and Brian was not granted a sufficient space of days, nor found a successor capable of fulfilling his self-imposed task. The final outburst—which ended in the death of



REMAINS OF STONE CROSS AT CASTLE-
DERMOT, KILDARE

Brian at the hour of victory, and threw Ireland back into hopeless confusion—arose, as might have been expected, from the wounded vanity of a provincial chief. Maelmorda, the defeated, of Glen Mama, was conducting to Brian's palace of Cenn-coradh three masts of pine. A dispute arose in ascending a boggy mountain, whereupon the chief himself put his hand to one of the masts. He had on him at the time a silken tunic which Brian had given him, and with the exertion one of the buttons of the tunic broke. When he arrived at Cenn-coradh he sent the tunic to his sister, Gormflaith, a former wife or mistress of Brian, to have it repaired. Gormflaith cast the tunic into the fire, and reproached her brother, saying she deemed it foul scorn that vassalage should be suffered by him, whose fathers had never endured it, and that his degradation would be entailed upon his children. Full of angry thoughts and discontent, Maelmorda stood by the next day at a game of chess played between Murcadh, who had dragged him from the yew tree at Glen Mama, and Conaing, a

nephew of Brian. Maelmorda having advised a move by which Murcadh lost the game, the latter cried, "'Twas thou that gavest advice to the foreigners when they were defeated!" Angry taunts were at once exchanged. "I will give them advice again, and they shall not be defeated." "Have a yew tree ready." Then Maelmorda turned and without leave-taking fled from the king's presence. Brian sent after him a messenger of peace; but the angry prince turned and struck him to the earth at the head of the bridge of Killaloe. "Some were anxious to pursue him then, and not to allow him to escape until he had made submission; but Brian said it should be at the threshold of his house he would demand justice from him, and that he would not prove treacherous to him in his own house."

Leinster at once rose to arms, and the most zealous allies of the insurgents were the Danes of Dublin, ever anxious to promote disorder. Sigtryggr was then the Danish king of Dublin; his mother was Gormflaith. "She was the fairest of all women, and best gifted in everything that was not in her own power; but it was the talk of men that she did all things evil over which she had any power." Gormflaith was the divorced wife, or the discarded mistress,

[1014 A.D.]

of Brian; and "so grim was she against King Brian after their parting that she would fain have him dead." King Sigtryggr was himself married to a daughter of Brian.

THE LEAGUE AGAINST BRIAN

The Dublin Danes, remembering the battle of Glen Mama, distrusted their own strength, and desired to enlist in their cause the Northmen of the western isles. The times were singularly propitious for such a project. The increasing power of the Norwegian king and the extension of Christianity had crippled the power of the western jarls. They feared and hated the extension of the sovereign power; they loathed Christianity as a religion forced upon them by brute violence. The doctrines of the Gospel had been preached among the Norse as they never were else. Their watchword was, "baptism or death," and those who unwillingly had submitted to that rule were eager to relapse, on the first safe opportunity, into their former faith. The western jarls must have readily accepted an alliance which promised to them fresh conquests, and an opportunity of establishing themselves in security after the old ways. Chief of the Orkney jarls was Sigurd, a Christian by name, but who had only yielded to the preaching of King Olaf, Tryggvi's son, when that zealous missionary had him entirely in his power, and had threatened to hew off his son's head before his eyes over the gunwale. To the court of Sigurd came King Sigtryggr seeking aid.¹



ROUND TOWER AT DOWAGHMORE

Sigurd hesitated when he learned that the great Brian was to be the object of their attack, but at last promised to make common cause with the Danish king of Dublin, on condition that should victory be theirs, he should be a king in Ireland and receive in marriage the hand of Sigtryggr's often-married but still beautiful mother, Gormflaith. Next Sigtryggr sought the aid of the brother vikings Ospak and Brodir, but Ospak chose to ally himself with Brian whom he admired. Brodir, who according to the Norse saga, *Burnt Nial*, was an apostate deacon, and is supposed to have been the Danish viking Gutring, joined the league against Brian.²

At the appointed time Earl Sigurd arrived in Dublin, proclaiming his heathendom by carrying in front of his army the famous raven banner, wrought by magic spells, which bore victory to the host before which it fluttered, but death to the man who bore it. Hither, too, came Brodir, the apostate deacon, and Maelmorda, with the men of Leinster, and the Hy-Kinshela of the county of Wexford.

Meanwhile Brian approached Dublin with the troops of Munster, Connaught, and Meath; having burned Kilmainham, he despatched his son, Donough, to plunder Leinster, and himself encamped on the Green of Dublin. "Brodir tried, by sorcery, how the fight would go; but the answer ran thus, that if the fight were on Good Friday, King Brian would fall but win the day; but if they fought before, they would all fall who were against him."

THE BATTLE OF CLONTARF

On the eve of the battle various portents appeared, which show how fully alive both parties were to the great issue between them. Odin appeared in the pagan army. During the night Brian was warned by the guardian spirit of his race. At length, on the morning of Good Friday, the allied army issued out from Dublin.

The Danes and Leinster men marching out from Dublin, instead of advancing northward, and securing their retreat to Dublin, turned due east towards Clontarf, losing all connection with the city, and trusting for retreat to their galleys, which were brought up to the shore.

The Irish army must have been drawn up facing the south or southwest. In its array, also, Irish and Danes were mingled. The viking Ospak was opposed to King Sigtryggr of Dublin, and the Irish of Leinster were opposed to the Munster Irish of Brian. For the Irish, their existence as a nation was staked upon victory and the life of Brian. By the Northmen the combat was regarded as the last struggle of heathendom.

The annalists inform us—and their statement was confirmed by incidental evidence—that the struggle was protracted from sunrise to sunset, when, at length, the allied Danes and Leinster men gave way. Dark forebodings that they were fighting on a losing side seem to have filled the breasts of the bravest Norse. Two successive bearers of the raven banner were slain. "The Earl Sigurd called on Thorstein, the son of Hall of the Side, to bear the banner, and Thorstein was just about to lift the banner, but then Asmund the White said:

"Don't bear the banner! for all they who bear it get their death.' 'Hrafn the Red!' called out Earl Sigurd, 'bear thou the banner.' 'Bear thine own devil thyself,' answered Hrafn. Then the earl said, 'Tis fittest that the beggar should bear the bag,' and with that he took the banner from the staff, and put it under his cloak."

Sigurd accepted his fate as the last hero of a beaten creed. The routed army was driven back not upon Dublin but upon the sea. A fierce struggle took place at the ford of the Tolka, the only means left of reaching Dublin, which the remnants of the Danes, flying towards the city, held against their pursuers.

The Irish legends tell us that all day long Sigtryggr viewed the battle from the battlements upon which, in the next century, the last Danish king was beheaded in view of the Scandinavian fleet. By him sat his wife, the daughter of Brian. As they saw on the northern shore of the bay the fury of the first assault of Sigurd's Orkney men, "Well do the foreigners reap the field," said the king to his wife; "many a sheaf do they cast from them." "The result will be seen," said she, "at the end of the day." As the flight of the Danes to their ships was seen by Sigtryggr and his wife, "It seems to me," said Brian's daughter, "that the foreigners have gained their patrimony." "What meanest thou, woman?" said the king. "Are they not rushing into the sea," said she, "which is their natural inheritance? I won-

[1014-1015 A.D.]

der are they in heat, like cattle? If so, they tarry not to be milked." In his rage the king struck her in the face.

Meanwhile what had been the fate of Brian? Too old to join personally in the combat, he remained in the rear of the host. A cushion was spread under him, and he opened his psalter, and as a Christian king he prayed for victory. As the day wore on, he asked for tidings—what was the condition of Murcadh's standard? He was told it was standing, and many banners of the Dal-Cais around it. Again he asked the same question, and was told that the banner of his tribe was flying at the west of the array. Towards evening he again repeated the question; he was told that of the armies on either side the greater part was slain, the foreigners were defeated, but Murcadh's standard had fallen.

On the death of his eldest and best-beloved son the old man lost all heart. He would not mount his horse and retire to the camp, and declared that in a vision the spirit of his house had foretold to him he should be slain. While he lingered, a party of Danes approached them; it was the viking Brodir, who, disdaining flight, had fought his way through the opposing enemy, and with two attendants alone sought the woods. "There are people coming towards us here," said his attendant to Brian. "Woe is me! What manner of people are they?" said Brian. "Blue, stark-naked people," said the attendant. "Alas!" said Brian, "they are foreigners of the army; it is not to do good to us they come." As Brodir, in his haste, passed by without observing the king, one of his attendants plucked him back, crying, "The king! The king! This is the king." "No," cried Brodir, "a priest! a priest!" "No," said the soldier, "it is the great king Brian." Brodir turned back and the last heathen viking and the only king of Ireland fell by each other's hands.

Both parties might now count their losses. The bravest and best of the champions on either side had fallen. The Irish army, mangled and weakened, held the field of battle. The remnant of the Danes and Leinster men still occupied Dublin, and the Danish fleet of Sigurd still rode at anchor in the bay. Both parties were practically defeated—both parties lost the great stake for which they had played. Ireland was not to be handed over to heathen invaders, nor was it longer to enjoy the blessing of a just and powerful government. This day of bloodshed and slaughter, of disaster and double failure, was long remembered in the annals of the North. For the last time by mortal eyes the weird sisters were seen to weave their fatal woof which they tore asunder, as if to typify that ruin and destruction fell that day on all alike. In their magic song they predicted that a new nation was to conquer and rule Erin.

After the battle Donnchad, Brian's son and heir, asserted his supremacy over the Irish, but the men of Munster insisted that the Dal-Cais had the right of alternate sovereignty at Cashel only, and demanded Donnchad's abdication. The son of Brian reiterated his claims, and the Munster men rose in arms. Thus within three days after Brian's death the Irish people, who under his strong hand had seemed in a fair way to become a united nation, had again fallen into the position of warring tribes.^a

IRELAND FROM THE BATTLE OF CLONTARF TO THE ANGLO-NORMAN INVASION

In the following year, 1015, Malachy, who was again recognised as king of Ireland, with the aid this time of the northern Hui Neill, burned Dublin and harried the Leinster clan the Hui Cennselaig. But the effects of Brian's revolution were permanent; the prescriptive rights of the Hui Neill were dis-

[1015-1153 A.D.]

puted, and after Clontarf, until the coming of the Normans, the history of Ireland consisted of a struggle for ascendancy between the O'Briens of Munster, the O'Neills of Ulster, and the O'Connors of Connaught. The power of the western Scandinavians was broken at Clontarf; no new invasion took place, chiefly no doubt because of their conversion to Christianity. They continued to hold their strongholds on the coasts, and occasional conflicts took place between them and their neighbours. Gradually, however, they assumed the position of native tribes; but, owing to the distinction of language, they did not readily fuse with the Goedel, though intermarriages were frequent. They fused much more readily with the Normans and English, not so much from any affinity of language, as from their civic life and commercial spirit being alike. The next generation saw Christianity the recognised faith of the Dano-Irish, who founded bishoprics, at first in connection with the church in Norway, but wholly unconnected with the Irish clan-bishops until a short time before the Anglo-Norman invasion.

The death of Malachy II, the last over-king acknowledged by the whole country, afforded an opportunity for an able and ambitious man to subdue Ireland, establish a strong central government, break up the tribal system, and assist the gradual fusion of factions into a homogeneous nation. Such a man did not, however, arise; those who afterwards claimed to be over-king lacked the qualities of founders of strong dynasties, and, though sometimes acknowledged by the greater part of the country, were never accepted as the legitimate rulers of the whole of Ireland. Even the Scandinavian towns of Ireland ceased to co-operate as one people. Their native chiefs were sometimes expelled and replaced by Irish ones, and the fusion of the two races went rapidly on.^b

Donnchad, the son of Brian Boruma, was never able to establish his claim to over-lordship, and after his overthrow by his nephew Turlough O'Brien and Dermot, king of Leinster, went on a pilgrimage to Rome where he died. Turlough and his son Murtough after him became king of Munster. The reign of the latter was marked by bitter warfare lasting over a quarter of a century with Domnall O'Loughlin, king of Ulster.^a

After the death of Murtough (1119) the power of the O'Briens was for a time broken by Turlough (Tordelbach) O'Connor, king of Connaught, and a pretender to the over-kingship—a man whom no tie or obligation bound. Conchobar (Connor) O'Brien, grandson of Murtough, succeeded however in defeating O'Connor; and his brother Turlough, who succeeded him, carried on the war until the whole country was reduced to that state so graphically described by the Four Masters^h as "a trembling sod." In the midst of this almost continuous war and devastation morals became relaxed, and the practice of religion almost ceased. The church property had passed into the hands of the lay successors, and no provision was made for the service of the churches, most of which were in ruins.

A true reformer, however, appeared in St. Malachy, who was appointed legate by Innocent II. Through his exertions a great synod was held at Kells under Cardinal Paparo (Malachy having died at Clairvaux in 1148) in 1152, at which true diocesan jurisdiction was established, Dublin being brought into connection with the Irish church, and raised to the rank of an archiepiscopal city; another archbishopric was founded at Tuam, to the great discontent of the northern and southern parties representing "Cond's Half" and "Mug's Half" in the church—the cardinal, as papal legate, having brought the palliums for the four archbishops. Tithes were also ordained to be levied for the support of the clergy, and many reforms decreed. Many churches and monas-

[1148-1156 A.D.]

teries were built, and great advance took place in architecture and artistic metal work, which were not mere imitations of foreign art, but the true outcome of the earlier period of Celtic art.

Between 1148 and 1150 Murtough O'Loughlin was acknowledged as over-king in three out of the four provinces. Turlough O'Brien, however, renewed the struggle between the north and south, but after he had received the homage of the Dano-Irish of Dublin a truce was arranged between the rivals. In 1151 the Munster king was deposed by his brother Tadg, who was supported by Turlough O'Connor, king of Connaught, with the assistance of Dermot MacMurrough (Diarmait MacMurchada). O'Loughlin took up the cause of his former rival, but was defeated by O'Connor. The latter died in 1156 after a long reign, and O'Loughlin remained undisputed over-king. Ruadri (Roderick) O'Connor succeeded his father Turlough, and signalled the beginning of his reign by blinding one brother and imprisoning two others. Murtough O'Loughlin, having blinded the chief of Dal-Araide—a savage mode of mutilation very much in fashion at the time—a league was formed against him, and he was defeated and slain, whereupon Roderick claimed to be over-king, and, there being no serious opposition, he was inaugurated with great pomp at Dublin, which already began to have considerable weight in Irish affairs, and had now for the first time assumed somewhat of the character of a metropolis.

Dermot MacMurrough was both by descent and position much mixed up with foreigners, and generally in a state of latent if not open hostility with the over-kings of the Hui Neill and Dal-Cais dynasties. He was a tyrant, and a man of bad character. In 1152 Tigernan O'Rourke, prince of Brefni, had been dispossessed of his territory by Turlough O'Connor, aided by Dermot, and the latter is accused of also carrying off Derbforgaill (Dervorgilla), O'Rourke's wife. It is probable, however, that the latter event has been entirely misrepresented, and that the lady had merely thrown herself, in accordance with Irish law, upon the protection of the Leinster king. However this may have been, the accession of Roderick to the chief kingship warned Dermot of his danger; and accordingly, on learning that O'Rourke was leading an army against him with the support of the over-king, he burned his castle of Ferns, and went to Henry II to ask his assistance. The results which followed belong to the next chapter, but here we may point out that many Irish princes before Dermot had sought the aid of foreigners, and that at that time, and especially in a tribal society, this was not regarded in the same light as in modern times.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL STATE OF IRELAND IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

To complete our account of pre-Norman Ireland, we shall give here a brief account of the social life of the Irish at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century, which indeed substantially represents the state of things during the whole period from the seventh to the twelfth century.

In the Middle Ages there were considerable forests in Ireland encompassing broad expanses of upland pastures and marshy meadows, unbroken up to the seventh century by ditch or dyke. There were no cities or large towns at the mouths of the rivers; no stone bridges spanned the latter; stepping stones or hurdle bridges at the fords or shallows offered the only mode of crossing the broadest rivers and connecting the unpaved roads or bridle paths which crossed the country over hill and dale. The forests abounded in game—the red deer and wild boar were common; and wolves ravaged the flocks, for the

most part unprotected by fences even in comparatively later times. Scattered over the country were numerous small hamlets, composed mainly of wicker cabins. Here and there were some large hamlets or villages that had grown up about groups of houses surrounded by an earthen mound or rampart. Sometimes the rampart was double, with a deep ditch between. The simple rampart and ditch enclosed a cattle-yard and the groups of houses of the owners, for every room was a separate house.

The enclosed houses belonged to the freemen called *airig* (sing., *aire*). The sizes of the houses and of the enclosing mound and ditch marked the rank (that is, the wealth) of the aire. If his wealth consisted of chattels only, he was a *bo-aire*, or cow-aire. When he possessed ancestral land, which was no doubt one of the consequences of the Scotie conquest, he was a *flaith* or lord, and was entitled to let his lands for grazing, to have a hamlet in which lived labourers, and to keep slaves. The larger fort with two or more ditches and ramparts was a *dun*, where the chieftain or *ri* lived, and kept his hostages if he had subreguli. The houses of all classes were of wood, chiefly wattles and wicker-work enclosing clay, and cylindrical in shape, with conical roofs thatched with rushes. The oratories were of the same form and material, but the larger churches and kingly banqueting halls were made of sawn boards. When St. Malachy, who lived in the first half of the twelfth century, thought of building a stone oratory at Bangor, it was deemed a novelty by the people. Long before this, however, stone churches had been built in other parts of Ireland, and many round towers.

Here and there in the neighbourhood of the hamlets were patches of corn grown upon allotments that were annually exchangeable among the inhabitants. Around the *duine* and *ratha* the cultivation was better, for the corn land was the fixed property of the lord, and began to be enclosed by fences in the seventh and succeeding centuries. Oats was the chief corn crop, but wheat and barley were also grown—chiefly, however, by the higher classes. The onion and the parsnip also were cultivated, and mark the first stage in kitchen gardening, which, as well as bee-keeping, was introduced by the church. Flax and the dye-plants were the chief industrial plants. Portions of the pasture lands were reserved as meadows. Tillage was rude, the spade and fork being of wood, although sometimes shod with iron. There are native names for the different parts of the plough, so we may assume that some form of that implement worked by oxen yoked together by a simple straight yoke was in use in the very early times. Wheeled carts were also known; the wheels were often probably only solid disks, though wheels formed of a hub, spokes, and felloes were used for chariots. The tilled land was manured. Drove of swine under the charge of swineherds wandered through the forests; some belonged to the chiefs, others to *flatha*, or lords, and others again to village communities. The house-fed pig was also an important object of domestic economy; its flesh—fresh, pickled, or in bacon—was much prized. Indeed, fresh pork was one of the inducements held out to visitors to *Tír Tairngire* or Elysium.

Horned cattle constituted the chief wealth of the country, and were the standard for estimating the worth of anything; for the Irish had no coined money, and carried on all commerce by barter. The unit of value was called a *set* (pl. *seuti*), which appears to mean literally a jewel or precious object of any kind. There were several kinds of *seuti*, differing somewhat in value. The king set was a full-grown cow after her third calf; the normal set was an average milch cow. Gold, silver, bronze, tin, clothes, and all other kinds of property were estimated in *séuti*, referred to the milch cow as the standard.

[ac. 600-1200 A.D.]

Three seuti, that is, three cows, were equal to a *cumal*, a word signifying a female slave, which reveals an important feature of Irish society to which we shall revert. Sheep formed an important element of wealth in some parts of the country, and goats were numerous. The old laws draw a distinction between the working horse and the riding horse; both kinds appear to have been numerous and of good breed. Bee cultivation was carefully attended to, the honey being used both for a kind of confectionery and for making metheglin or mead. So important a place did bee culture hold in the rural economy of the ancient Irish that the laws regarding bees still extant would fill a goodly volume.

The ancient Irish were a pastoral people, and therefore had certain nomadic habits. When they had sown their corn, they drove their herds and flocks to the mountains, where such existed, and spent the summer there, returning in autumn to reap their corn and take up their abode in their sheltered winter residences. Where the tribe had land on the sea-coast they also appear to have migrated thither in summer. The chase in the summer occupied the freemen, not only as a source of enjoyment, but also as a matter of necessity, for wolves were very numerous. For this purpose they bred dogs of great swiftness, strength, and sagacity, which seem to have been much admired by the Romans.

Households of the Chiefs and Kings

We have said that the residences within enclosing ramparts did not consist of one house with several apartments, but every room was a separate house. Thus, to take the residence of an aire, he had the living house, in which he slept as well as took his meals, the women's house, in which spinning and other domestic work was carried on, the kitchen, the barn, the calf-house, the pig-sty, and the sheep-house. In the residence of chiefs and *flatha* a sun-chamber or *grianan* was also provided for the mistress of the house, which in the large *duine* appears to have been put on the rampart, so as to escape the shadow of the latter. The round houses were made by forming two basket-like cylinders, one within the other, and separated by an annular space of about a foot, by inserting upright posts in the ground and interweaving hazel wattles between, the annular space being filled with clay. Upon this cylinder was placed a conical cap, thatched with reeds or straw.

The early Irish houses had no chimney; the fire was made in the centre of the house, and the smoke made its exit through the door or through a hole in the roof, as in the corresponding Gaulish and German houses. Near the fire, fixed in a kind of candlestick, was a candle of tallow or raw beeswax, which gave a lurid, smoky flame; this marked a notable advance upon the use of a piece of bog-deal. Around the wall in the houses of the wealthy and higher classes were arranged the bedsteads, or rather compartments, with testers and fronts, which were sometimes of carved yew. The beds were made of skin stuffed with feathers. Wooden platters, drinking horns, and vessels of yew and bronze were displayed on dressers. Of pottery there was none. Large chests and cupboards for holding clothes, meal, and other things were placed in convenient places. In the halls of the kings, of whom there were several grades, the position of each person's bed and seat, and the joint of meat which he was entitled to receive from the distributor were regulated according to a rigid rule of precedence. The arms and horse trappings of the master of the house were also displayed on the walls; and in the king's house each person who had a seat in it had his shield suspended over him.

Every king had hostages for the fealty of his vassals, who sat unarmed in the hall, and those who had become forfeited by a breach of treaty or allegiance were placed along the wall in fetters. The position of a hostage in ancient times was at best unpleasant, but when those who gave him in hostage-ship broke their engagements his lot was truly a hard one; he was fettered and his life was forfeited. There were places in the king's hall for the judge, the *fili* or poet, the harper, the various craftsmen, the juggler, and fool. The king had his bodyguard of four men always around him; these were freed men whom the king had delivered from slavery inherited from birth, or to which they had been condemned for crime or debt, for an insolvent debtor became in Ireland, as in Rome and, indeed, in most ancient societies, the property of his creditor. In an age of perpetual warfare and violence, the gratitude of a slave was esteemed a greater safeguard than even the ties of blood—a fact which suggests some curious reflections concerning the origin of offices at the courts of kings.

There were also numerous attendants about a king's house and a lord's house; these were a very miscellaneous body; among them were many Saxon slaves and the descendants of former slaves, for after the cessation of the Irish incursions a regular slave trade grew up, which was only abolished by the action of the church not long before the Norman invasion. These attendants slept on the ground, in the kitchen, or in cabins outside the fort. It was only the higher classes who were provided with beds, and in early times not even these. The living room or hall we have been describing also served in part as a kitchen, for joints were roasted at the fire in winter, the soup boiler was suspended over it, the brewing vat was in it. The house we have called the kitchen was rather a room for grinding meal in hand-mills, a work done by females (who were slaves in the houses of lords and kings), the making of bread, cheese, etc.

Fosterage and Marriage

The children of the upper classes in Ireland were not reared at home, but were sent to some one else to be fostered. The children of the greater kings were generally fostered by minor kings, and even by kings of their own rank. The *ollam fili*, or chief poet, ranked in some respects with a tribe king, sent his sons to be fostered by the king of his own territory. The fosterage might be done for friendship or for some special advantage, but it was generally a matter of profit, and there are numerous laws extant fixing the cost, and regulating the food and dress of the foster child according to his rank. It was customary to educate together a number of youths of very different ranks, and the laws laid down regulations for the clothing, food, and other expenses of each grade. In like manner a number of maidens were fostered together, those of inferior rank serving as companions for the daughter of a king. The cost of the fosterage of boys seems to have been borne by the mother's property, that of the daughters by the father's. The ties created by fosterage were nearly as close and as binding on the children as those of blood. Fosterage was apparently the consequence of the marriage customs.

It has been stated above that pagan marriage customs survived the introduction of Christianity. Of this there is ample evidence. As among all tribal communities, the wealth of the contracting parties constituted the primary element of a legitimate marriage. The bride and bridegroom should be provided with a joint fortune proportionate to their rank. When the bride and bridegroom were of equal rank, and the sept of each contributed an equal

[ca. 600-1200 A.D.]

share to the marriage portion, the marriage was legal in the full sense, and the wife was a wife of equal rank. If the bride were noble and the bridegroom not, the former had to contribute one-third of the marriage portion to fulfil the condition of equality. If the bridegroom was the son of a *flaith*, and the bride the daughter of a *cowaire*, the former contributed one-third and the latter two-thirds. In this kind of marriage the husband and wife had equal rights over the joint property. The wife of equal rank was the chief wife in pagan times, and where the conditions were not fulfilled the woman occupied an inferior position, and might have another woman placed over her as principal wife. The church endeavoured to make the wife of a first marriage, that is, the wife according to canon law, the only true wife according to Irish law, but in this it is clear it did not at once succeed.

The struggle between the marriage laws of the church and the ancient customs is curiously illustrated by the continuance of what, according to canon and feudal law, was concubinage, as a recognised condition of things according to Irish law. These marriages may be called contract marriages, and were of various kinds, depending mainly on questions of property, and were entered into with the cognizance of the man's chief wife and of his sept. When a woman had sons her position was greatly altered, and her position did not materially differ in some respects from that of a chief wife. As the tie of the sept was blood, all the acknowledged children of a man, whether legitimate or illegitimate according to canon and feudal law, belonged equally to his sept. Even adulterine bastardy was no bar to a man becoming chief or *ri* of his *tuath*, or tribe, as was shown in the case of Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone. As all the children of a chief of household, of whatever rank, had equal rights in the sept, notwithstanding the efforts of the church to restrict those rights to the children of marriages according to canon law, it was necessary to commit their rearing and education to some one outside their own sept; hence the system of fosterage, which at one time prevailed in all Aryan communities, as did also, no doubt, the whole of the Irish marriage customs, which are a survival in a singularly complete and archaic form of customs which had died out elsewhere under the influence of Roman and canon law.

The food of the ancient Irish was very simple, and their table service equally so. The former consisted mainly of cakes of oaten bread, cheese, curds, milk, butter, and the flesh of all the domestic animals fresh and salted. In the eighth century at all events wheat and barley meal were also used by the better classes. The legendary food of the Land of Promise consisted of fresh pork, new milk, and ale. Of course fish, especially the salmon, and game are also to be added to the list. The opsonia were very limited—onions and watercresses. The food of the monks was chiefly oaten bread, milk, and curd-cheese. The chief drink was ale, the right to brew it being apparently confined to *flatha* (nobility), as was the case in many parts of Germany down to the end of the Middle Ages. It seems to have been expected that a *flaith* should be generous to his vassals, retainers, and all those about him; the word for open-handedness in Irish, *flaitheamhuil*, is derived from his name; an aphorism fixes the time at which he was expected to be bountiful, "for he is not a lawful *flaith* who does not distribute ale on a Sunday." All the business of the sept and tribe was conducted in the ale-house, or *cuirmtéach*, as the chief men of the tribe were called its props—*sabaid cuirmtígi*. The bards chanted poems, and songs were sung to the music of a kind of harp, called a *crúot*, or of a bowed instrument called a *timpan*; stories were also told, and the guests of the ale-house were content to hear the same story over and over again. The ollam fili, who only told his story to kings, was,

however, expected to know more than seven times fifty great and small stories. The amusements were also varied by the jokes of the fool and the tricks of the juggler, as in the baronial halls of the Normans at a later period.

Dress

The dress of the upper classes was similar to that of a Scottish Highlander before it degenerated into the later conventional garb of a Highland regiment. It consisted first of the *lenn*, a kind of loose shirt generally of woollen cloth (but linen ones are mentioned), reaching a little below the knees of men, and forming what is now called the kilt. This garment was of different colours, some being spotted, checkered, and variegated, each tribe or clan having apparently special colours. It would also seem that the number of colours



REMAINS OF OLD CHURCH AND ROUND TOWER AT KILCULLEN

in the dress indicated the rank of the wearer. The *lenna* of kings and the wealthy *flatha* were embroidered, furnished with borders, and even fringe of gold is mentioned. Over the *lenn* came the *inar*, a kind of closely fitting tunic reaching to the hips, and bound around the waist by the *criss*, a girdle or scarf often of some rich colour, especially purple, and frequently, in the case of the men's, the gift of a woman. The *inar* or jacket appears to have been open at the breast so as to show off the embroidery of the *lenn*. Over the left shoulder, and fastened with a brooch, hung the *brat*, a shawl or plaid like the modern Scottish one. This garment replaced the skin or fur of a wild beast of earlier times, and the brooch the thorn with which it was fastened. The brooches were often of beautiful workmanship, as is shown by the numerous examples exhibiting endless variety of design which are now preserved in museums.

The legs were bare or covered with a kind of legging or hose fastened by thongs; the feet were entirely naked or encased in shoes of raw-hide, also fastened with thongs. The only difference between the dress of men and women was that the *lenn* of the latter reached nearly to the ankles and formed a petticoat instead of a kilt. The freemen wore their hair long, and prided themselves on its curling into ringlets. They sometimes confined it at the back of the head in a conical spiral of bronze, silver, or gold. The women also wore their hair long, and braided it into tresses, which they confined with a pin. The beard was worn long, and was carefully cultivated, being often plaited into tresses. The men as well as women, like all ancient and semi-

[ca. 800-1200 A.D.]

barbarous people, were fond of ornaments. They tattooed figures with woad on their bodies like the Britons and Picts. They covered their fingers with rings, their arms with bracelets; they wore torques or twisted rings of gold about the neck. The richer and more powerful kings wore a similar torque about the waist, and a golden *mind* or diadem on state occasions. Every woman of rank wore finger rings, bracelets, earrings, and a *lann* or crescent-shaped blade of gold on the front of the head, from which hung behind a veil. The queens also wore a golden mind or diadem on state occasions.

The mind was so attached to a veil or some kind of headdress that it seems to have formed a complete covering for the head. Ladies also had carved combs and ornamental workboxes; they used oil for the hair, and dyed their eyelashes black with the juice of a berry, and their nails crimson with a dye like archil. The *lenn* or kilt seems to have been the garb of freemen only; the men of the servile classes wore *braccae*, or tight-fitting breeches, reaching to near the ankles, the upper part of the body being either left altogether naked, or covered by a short cloak without sleeves. In winter all classes appear to have worn a long coat or cloak with a *cochull* or hood. Coats or cloaks of this kind made of a brown frieze were regarded in the seventh and eighth centuries as peculiarly Irish, owing, no doubt, to the great number of missionaries and scholars from Ireland who wandered over Europe clothed in such long cloaks, with a book wallet and a kind of leather bottle slung on their shoulders, and a thick, knotted staff in the hand. It is from them the Benedictine monks borrowed the dress which has since become the characteristic habit of religious orders. The name cowl in English, and all the cognate forms in other languages, are, no doubt, from the Gaulish word corresponding to the Irish *cochull*. The two Irishmen who accompanied the Iceland, Thorfinn Karlsefnisson, in his voyage from Greenland when he discovered America in the ninth century, wore coats which are called by the same name which the Northmen gave the monk's cowl.

The principal weapon of the Irish soldiers was a pike or lance with a very long handle; some were also armed with a short sword suspended by a belt across the shoulder, and a shield. It is probable that bronze lance-heads and swords were used down to early Christian times, and even later, though the use of iron weapons must have been known from the period of the Scotie invasions of Britain. The shields were of two kinds: one a light round or slightly oval wooden target covered with hide, and in earlier times in the case of rich warriors a bronze disk with numerous bosses, backed with wood; and the other the *sciath* or oblong bulged shield of wicker work covered with hide. Some carried stone hammers or war axes, and in the ninth and succeeding centuries an iron one, the use of which was learned from the Northmen. War-hats, cuirasses, and other defensive armour were very little if at all used before the Danish wars. In Irish legendary tales some of the heroes are equipped in leather cuirasses, and wear crested helmets and war-hats, but these are no doubt interpolations in the narrative of later times.

Landholding

The *tuath* or territory of a *ri* or king was divided among the *septs*. The lands of a sept (*fine*) consisted of the estates in severalty of the lords (*flatha*), and of the *ferand duthaig* or common lands of the sept. The dwellers on each of these kinds of land differed materially from each other. On the former lived a motley population of slaves, horse boys, and mercenaries composed of broken men of other clans, many of whom were fugitives from justice

(*macca bais*, literally "sons of death"), etc., possessing no rights either in the sept or tribe, and entirely dependent on the bounty of the lord, and consequently living about his fortified residence. The poorer servile classes, or cottiers, wood-cutters, swineherds, etc., who had right of domicile (acquired after three generations), lived here and there in small hamlets on the mountains and poorer lands of the estate. The good lands were let to a class of tenants called *fuidirs*, of whom there were several kinds, some grazing the land with their own cattle, others receiving both land and cattle from the lord. *Fuidirs* had no rights in the clan or sept; some were true serfs, others tenants-at-will; they lived in scattered homesteads like the farmers of the present time. The lord was responsible before the law for the acts of all the servile classes on his estates, both newcomers and *senchleithe*, i.e., descendants of *fuidirs*, slaves, etc., whose families had lived on the estate during the time of three lords. He paid their blood-fines, etc., and received compensation for their slaughter, maiming, or plunder. The *fuidirs* were the chief source of a lord's wealth, and he was consequently always anxious to increase them.

As every man in a fine or sept had a right to build a house on the *ferand duthaig* or common land, the size of the house and extent of land which might be permanently enclosed as a yard or lawn depending upon the rank of the man, that is, upon his wealth, the clansmen occupied chiefly isolated homesteads and cabins; some of the latter being occasionally grouped in hamlets. Clansmen who possessed twenty-one cows and upwards were *airig* (sing. *aire*), or as we should say had the franchise, and might fulfil the functions of bail, witness, etc. When an *aire* died his family did not always divide the inheritance, but formed "a joint and undivided family" the head of which was an *aire*, and thus kept up the rank of the family. Three or four poor clansmen might combine their property and agree to form a "joint family," one of whom as the head would be an *aire*. In consequence of this organisation the homesteads of *airig* included several families—those of his brothers, sons, etc. A rich *bo-aire* (cow-aire, i.e., an *aire* whose wealth consisted in cattle) was allotted a certain portion of the common land in consideration of affording hospitality to travellers entitled to free quarters from the clan; he was called a *briugu* (gen. *briugad*) or *bruigfer*, that is, man of the *brog* or *burg*. He acted as a kind of rural magistrate, and the meetings of a clan for the election of the *ri* took place at his house or *brog*. The stock of a *bo-aire* was partly his own and partly the gift of the chief. Every man was bound to accept stock from the chief proportionate to his rank; in return he was obliged to pay a certain customary tribute (*bes tigi*, house tribute). A man might also agree to take more stock and pay rent in kind. Such men, whose position was, however, thereby much altered, were called *biathachs* (from *biad*, food). A man might with the consent of his sept enter into a similar contract with the *flaith* of another sept, so that the *biathachs* or victuallers included also some of those called *fuidirs*. A lord might receive his *biad* or food at his own residence, or go to the house of his *biathach* accompanied by a retinue and eat it there, or send his mercenaries, horses, dogs, etc., there, to be supported, which was the usual way. The *biathachs* were consequently liable to suffer great oppression.

Learned Professions; the Assemblies

The professions accounted noble, such as those of *ecna* (wisdom), which included law and medicine, and *filidecht* or divination, which in Christian times was that of the bards or rhymesters, formed a number of schools each

[ca. 600-1200 A.D.]

under an *ollam* or doctor, who was provided with mensal land for the support of himself and his scholars. He was also entitled to free quarters for himself and a retinue, including dogs and horses, so that when he travelled he had a kind of ambulatory school with him. The *ollam bretheman* or chief of a law school was the chief *brithem* (brehon or judge) of his tuath. The *liag* or leech had also his apprentices, and treated his surgical patients in his own house. The harper, the *cerd* or artist in metals, and the smith were also provided with mensal land, and gave their skill and the product of their labour as their *bes tigi* or customary tribute in return for the gifts bestowed by their chief.

Popular assemblies, which were held in the open air, were of various kinds; thus the *methel flatha* was a gathering of the vassals of a lord to reap his corn, clear his roads, etc. The fine or sept had its special meeting, summoned by the aire fine or chief of the sept for many purposes, such as the assessment of blood-fines due from the sept, and the distribution of those due to it. The clan had also its gathering to deliberate on important questions, such as peace and war, in which every aire or fully qualified clansman had a voice. The most important of all popular assemblies was, however, the *oenach* or fair, summoned by a king, those summoned by the kings of provinces having the character of national assemblies. The *oenach* had a fourfold object: (1) the promulgation of laws, and the rehearsal of pedigrees upon which depended the succession of the princes; (2) the recitation of poetry and tales, musical contests, exhibition of works of artists in metals, etc., and the award of prizes to the professional classes; (3) popular sports, such as horse-racing, wrestling, etc.; and (4) the barter of all kinds of wares. The *oenach* in pagan times was an essentially religious festival celebrated in the great cemeteries, each clan, and in the minor fairs each sept, holding its assembly on the grave mound of their ancestors. Nor did it entirely lose its religious character in Christian times, for the *oenach* opened and closed with religious ceremonies. The women and men assembled in separate *airechta* or gatherings, and no man durst enter the women's *airecht* under pain of death. The *brithem* (brehon) or judge seated on a stone chair raised above the heads of the people delivered his judgment, the *suide* recounted the pedigrees of the chiefs, the *filid* sounded their praises and told the deeds of the clans in verse, the *cerda* or artists in metal exhibited their work. Foreign traders came thither with their wares, which they exchanged for native produce, especially for the coarse woollen fabrics which even in the eighth century were celebrated on the Continent. Every one was expected to appear at the *oenach* or fair in his or her best clothes and ornaments, and careful provision was made by the law to prevent creditors from unjustly withholding ornaments pledged with them on the occasion of a fair. Crimes committed at an *oenach* or other solemn assembly could not be commuted by payment of fines. The inauguration of a king took place at some sacred place where there was an ancient tree or grove, the *nemet* of the clan, the cutting down of which was the greatest insult a conqueror could offer to the conquered.^b

ENGLAND AND IRELAND

Up to this time almost the only connection between England and Ireland was that of the commerce carried on between some of the opposite ports; scarcely any political intercourse had ever taken place between the two countries. Her church, indeed, attached Ireland to the rest of Christendom; and some correspondence is still preserved that passed between her kings and prelates and the English archbishops Lanfranc and Anselm, relating

chiefly to certain points in which the latter conceived the ecclesiastical discipline of the neighbouring island to stand in need of reformation. The bishops also of the Danish towns in Ireland appear to have been usually consecrated by the archbishop of Canterbury.^k

It is related that William Rufus, standing once on the Welsh cliffs, looked across the waters toward Ireland and cried, "Some day I will gather together all the ships of my kingdom and make a bridge of them upon which I shall cross over to that land and conquer it." A certain king of Leinster to whom the story of the king's boastful threat was related, after listening thoughtfully to the relation asked quietly, "After uttering such a mighty threat as that did this king add 'if the Lord will'?" Receiving a negative reply the Irishman returned, "Since he expects to accomplish this conquest by his own power, and without divine aid, I think I need not greatly fear his coming."^a

But almost the single well-authenticated instance of any interference by the one nation in the civil affairs of the other since the Norman conquest, was in the rebellion of Robert de Belesme, in the beginning of the reign of Henry I, when that nobleman's brother, Arnulph de Montgomery, is said by some of the Welsh chroniclers to have passed over to Ireland, and to have there obtained from King Murtough O'Brien, both supplies for the war and the hand of his daughter for himself. It is said, indeed, that both the Conqueror and Henry I had meditated the subjugation of Ireland; and Malmesbury⁴ affirms that the latter English king had Murtough and his successors so entirely at his devotion that they wrote nothing but adulation of him, nor did anything but what he ordered.

It would appear that a project of conquest had been entertained by Henry II, from the very commencement of his reign. The same year in which he came to the throne witnessed the elevation to the papedom of the only Englishman that ever wore the triple crown—Nicholas Breakspeare, who assumed the name of Adrian IV. Very soon after his coronation Henry sent an embassy to Rome, at the head of which was the learned John of Salisbury, ostensibly to congratulate Adrian on his succession, but really to solicit the new pope for his sanction to the scheme of the conquest of Ireland. Adrian granted a bull, in the terms or to the effect desired, and before the end of the same year the matter was submitted by Henry to a great council of his barons; but the undertaking was opposed by many of those present, and especially by his mother, the empress; and in consequence it was for the time given up.

Henry's attention was not recalled to the subject till many years after. The course of the story now carries us back again to Ireland, and to another of the provincial kings of that country of whom we have yet said nothing—Dermot MacMurrough, king of Leinster. This prince had early signalised himself by his sanguinary ferocity, even on a stage where all the actors were men of blood. So far back as the year 1140, in order to break the power of his nobility, he had seventeen of the chief of them seized at once, all of whom that he did not put to death he deprived of their eyes.

His most noted exploit, however, was of a different character. Dervorgilla, a lady of great beauty, was the wife of Tiernan O'Rourke, the lord of Brefni, a district in Leinster, and the old enemy of MacMurrough. The sworn foe of her husband, however, was the object of Dervorgilla's guilty passion; and at her own suggestion, it is said, when her husband was absent on a military expedition, the king of Leinster came and carried her off. This happened in the year 1153, when the supreme sovereignty was in the possession of Turlough O'Connor. To him O'Rourke applied for the means of avenging his wrong, and received from him such effective assistance as to be enabled to

[1153-1168 A.D.]

recover both his wife and the property she had carried off with her. But from this time MacMurrough and O'Rourke kept up a spiteful contest, with alternating fortunes, for many years. So long as Turlough lived, O'Rourke had a steady ally in the common sovereign, and the king of Leinster was effectually kept in check by their united power.

The succeeding reign of O'Loughlin, on the other hand, was, for the whole of the ten years that it lasted, a period of triumphant revenge to MacMurrough. But the recovery of the supremacy on O'Loughlin's death, by the house of O'Connor, at last put an end to the long and bitter strife. A general combination was now formed against the king of Leinster; King Roderick, the lord of Brefni, and his father-in-law, the prince of Meath, united their forces for the avowed purpose of driving him from the kingdom; they were joined by many of his own subjects, both Irish and Danish, to whom his tyranny had rendered him odious; and O'Rourke put himself at the head of the whole. MacMurrough made some effort to defend himself; but finding himself deserted by all, he sought safety in flight, and left his kingdom for the present to the disposal of his conquerors. They set another prince of his own family on the vacant throne.

Meanwhile the deposed and fugitive king had embarked for England, to seek the aid of King Henry, in return for which he was ready to acknowledge himself the vassal of the English monarch. On landing at Bristol, some time in the summer of 1167, he found that Henry was on the Continent, and thither he immediately proceeded. Henry, when he came to him in Aquitaine, was "busied," says Giraldus,¹ "in great and weighty affairs, yet most courteously he received him and liberally rewarded him. And the king, having at large and orderly heard the causes of his exile, and of his repair unto him, he took his oath of allegiance and swore him to be his true vassal and subject, and thereupon granted and gave him letters-patent in manner and form as followeth: 'Henry, king of England, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, and earl of Anjou, unto all his subjects, Englishmen, Normans, Scots, and all other nations and people being his subjects, sendeth greeting. Whosoever these our letters shall come unto you, know ye that we have received Dermot, prince of Leinster, into our protection, grace, and favour; wherefore, whosoever within our jurisdiction will aid and help him, our trusty subject, for the recovery of his land, let him be assured of our favour and license in that behalf.'"

THE GERALDINES

It would scarcely appear, from the tenour of these merely permissive letters, that Henry looked forward to any result so important as the conquest of Ireland; the other "great and weighty affairs" had long withdrawn his thoughts from that project; and embarrassed both by his war with the French king, and his more serious contest with Becket at home, he was at present as little as ever in a condition to resume the serious consideration of it. Dermot MacMurrough, however, returned to England, well satisfied with what he had got. "And by his daily journeying," proceeds Giraldus, "he came at length unto the noble town of Bristow (Bristol), where, because ships and boats did daily repair, and come from out of Ireland, he, very desirous to hear of the state of his people and country, did, for a time, sojourn and make his abode; and whilst he was there, he would oftentimes cause the king's letters to be openly read, and did then offer great entertainment and promised liberal wages to all such as would help or serve him; but it served not."

[1168-1169 A.D.]

At length, however, he chanced to meet Richard de Clare, earl of Pembroke, surnamed Strongbow, with whom he soon came to an agreement. Strongbow, on the promise of the hand of Dermot's eldest daughter, Eva, and the succession to the throne of Leinster, engaged to come over to Ireland, with a sufficient military force to effect the deposed king's restoration, in the following spring. A short time after this, Dermot having gone to the town of St. David's, there made another engagement with two young noblemen, Maurice Fitz-Gerald and Robert Fitz-Stephen, both sons of the Lady Nesta, a daughter of one of the Welsh princes Rhys-ap-Tudor, who, after having been mistress to Henry I, married Gerald, governor of Pembroke Castle, and lord of Carew, and finally became wife of Stephen de Marisco or Maurice,



CHRIST CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN

Built about 1088

constable of the castle of Cardigan: Fitz-Gerald was her son by her first marriage, and Fitz-Stephen by her second.

To these two half-brothers, in consideration of their coming over to him with a certain force at the same time with Strongbow, Dermot engaged to grant the town of Wexford, with two cantreds (or hundreds) of land adjoining in fee for ever. These arrangements being completed, "Dermot," continues the historian, "being weary of his exiled life and distressed estate, and therefore the more desirous to draw homewards for the recovery of his own, and for which he had so long travelled and sought abroad, he first went to the church of St. David's to make his orisons and prayers, and then, the weather being fair and wind good, he adventured the seas about the middle of August, and having a merry passage, he shortly landed in his ungrateful country; and, with a very impatient mind, hazarded himself among and through the middle of his enemies; and, coming safely to Ferns, he was very honourably received of the clergy there, who after their ability did refresh and succour him. But he for a time dissembling his princely estate, continued as a private man all that winter following among them." It would appear, however, that he was rash enough to show himself in arms in the beginning of the year 1169,

[¹ Geraldus Cambrensis, the historian of the invasion, was himself closely related to the principal actors in this remarkable drama. He was the son of Nesta's daughter Angareth and William de Barri, ancestor of the Irish Barrys.]

[1160 A.D.]

before any of his promised English succours had arrived; and that the result of this premature attempt was, that he was again easily beaten by King Roderick and O'Rourke.

THE COMING OF THE ANGLO-NORMANS

His allies in England meanwhile did not forget him. Robert Fitz-Stephen was the first to set out about the beginning of May, accompanied with thirty gentlemen of his own kindred, sixty men in coats of mail, and three hundred picked archers; they shipped themselves in three small vessels, and sailing right across from St. David's Head, landed at a creek now called the Bann, about twelve miles to the south of the city of Wexford. Along with them also came the paternal uncle of Strongbow, Hervey de Montemarisco or Mountmaurice. On the day following two more vessels arrived at the same place, bearing Maurice of Prendergast, "a lusty and a hardy man, born about Milford, in West Wales," with ten more gentlemen and sixty archers. Mac-Murrough was not long in hearing of their arrival, on which he instantly sent five hundred men to join them, under his illegitimate son Donald, and "very shortly after, he himself also followed with great joy and gladness."

It was now determined to march upon the town of Wexford. "When they of the town," proceeds the narrative, "heard thereof, they being a fierce and unruly people, but yet much trusting to their wonted fortune, came forth about two thousand of them, and were determined to wage and give battle." On beholding the imposing armour and array of the English, however, they drew back, and, setting the suburbs on fire, took refuge within the walls of the town. For that day all the efforts of the assailants to effect an entrance were vain. The next morning, after the solemn celebration of mass, they made ready to renew the assault upon the town; but the besieged, seeing this, lost heart, and saved them further trouble by offering to surrender. Four of the chief inhabitants were given up to MacMurrough as pledges for the fidelity of their fellow-citizens; and he, on his part, immediately performed his promise to his English friends, by making over to Fitz-Stephen and Fitz-Gerald the town that had thus fallen into his hands, with the territories thereunto adjoining and appertaining. To Hervey of Mountmaurice he also gave two cantreds, lying along the seaside between Wexford and Waterford.

This first exploit was followed up by an incursion into the district of Ossory, the prince of which had well earned the enmity of Dermot by having some years before seized his eldest son and put out his eyes. The Ossorians at first boldly stood their ground, and as long as they kept to their bogs and woods, the invading force, though now increased by an accession from the town of Wexford to about three thousand men, made little impression upon them; but at last they were imprudent enough to allow themselves to be drawn into the open country, when Robert Fitz-Stephen fell upon them with a body of horse, and threw down the ill-armed and unprotected multitude, or scattered them in all directions; those that were thrown to the ground the foot-soldiers straight despatched, cutting off their heads with their battle-axes. Three hundred bleeding heads were laid at the feet of Dermot, "who, turning every of them, one by one, to know them, did then for joy hold up both his hands, and with a loud voice thanked God most highly. Among these there was the head of one whom especially and above all the rest he mortally hated; and he, taking up that by the hair and ears, with his teeth most horribly and cruelly bit away his nose and lips!" After this disaster the people of Ossory made no further resistance; they suffered their invaders to march across the

whole breadth of their country, murdering, spoiling, burning, and laying waste wherever they passed.

All this had taken place before anything was heard of MacMurrough's old enemies, King Roderick and O'Rourke, whom surprise and alarm seem to have deprived at first of the power of action. But news was now brought that the monarch was levying an army, and that the princes and nobility of the land were, at his call, about to meet in a great council at the ancient royal seat of Tara, in Meath. On receiving this intelligence, Dermot and his English friends, withdrawing from Ossory, took up a position of great natural strength in the midst of the hills and bogs in the neighbourhood of Ferns. Their small force was speedily surrounded by the numerous army of King Roderick, and it would seem that if they could not have been attacked in their stronghold, they might have been starved into a surrender, at no great expense of patience. But, notwithstanding the inferiority of their numbers, Roderick appears to have been a good deal more afraid of them than they were of him; disunion had broken out in the council, which, after assembling at Tara, had adjourned to Dublin; and the Irish king had probably reason to fear that, if he could not bring the affair to a speedy termination, he would soon be left in no condition to keep the field at all.

In this feeling he attempted, by presents and promises, to seduce Fitz-Stephen; failing in that, he next tried to persuade MacMurrough to come over and make common cause with his countrymen against the foreigners; at last, when there was reason to apprehend that the enemy, encouraged by these manifestations of timidity, were about to come out and attack him he actually sent messengers to sue for peace; on which, after some negotiations, it was agreed that MacMurrough should be reinstated in his kingdom.

It does not appear what terms MacMurrough professed to make in his treaty for his English allies. It is affirmed that it was agreed between him and Roderick that he should send them all home as soon as he had restored his kingdom to order, and in the mean time should procure no more of them to come over. But other forces were already on their way from England, and those in Ireland looked to remain there. This was soon proved by the arrival at Wexford of two more ships, bringing over Maurice Fitz-Gerald, with an additional force of ten gentlemen, thirty horsemen, and about one hundred archers and foot soldiers. On receiving this accession of strength, MacMurrough immediately cast his recent engagements and oaths to the winds. His first movement with his new auxiliaries was against the city of Dublin, which had not fully returned to its submission; he soon compelled the citizens to sue for peace, to swear fealty to him, and to give hostages. He then sent a party of his English friends to assist his son-in-law, the prince of Limerick, whose territory had been attacked by King Roderick. The royal forces were speedily defeated.

STRONGBOW

From this time MacMurrough and the English adventurers seem to have raised their hopes to nothing short of the conquest of the whole country. By their advice he despatched messengers to England to urge the earl of Pembroke to come over with his force immediately. All Leinster, he said, was completely reduced, and there could be no doubt that the earl's presence with the force he had engaged to bring with him would soon add the other provinces to that conquest.

[1170 A.D.]

Strongbow' deemed it prudent, before he took any decided step, to inform King Henry of the proposal, and obtain the royal sanction to comply with it. Henry, with his usual deep policy, would only answer his request evasively; but the earl ventured to understand him in a favourable sense, and returned home with his mind made up for the venture. As soon as the winter was over he sent to Ireland, as the first portion of his force, ten gentlemen and seventy archers, under the command of his relation, Raymond Fitz-William, surnamed, from his corpulency, *le Gros*, afterwards altered into the Anglo-Irish name of Grace. He and his company landed at a rock about four miles east from the city of Waterford, in the beginning of May, 1170.

They had scarcely time to cast a trench and to build themselves a temporary fort of turf and twigs. when they were attacked by a body of three



CASTLE AND ABBEY OF CASTLEDERMOTT, KILDARE

Founded in the 12th century

thousand of the people of Waterford; but this mob were scattered with frightful slaughter. Five hundred of them were cut down in the pursuit; and then, as Giraldus asserts, the "victors, being weary with killing, cast a great number of those whom they had taken prisoners headlong from the rocks into the seas, and so drowned them."

The earl of Pembroke did not set sail till the beginning of September. He then embarked at Milford Haven, with a force of two hundred gentlemen, and one thousand fighting men, and on the vigil of St. Bartholomew landed in the neighbourhood of the city of Waterford, which still remained unreduced. On the following day Raymond le Gros came with great joy to welcome him, attended by forty of his company. "And on the morrow, upon St. Bartholomew's Day, being Tuesday, they displayed their banners, and in good array they marched to the walls of the city, being fully bent and determined to give the assault."

The citizens, however, defended themselves with great spirit; and the assailants were twice driven back from the walls. But Raymond, who, by the consent of all, had been appointed to the command, now "having espied a little house of timber, standing half upon posts without the walls, called his men together, and encouraged them to give a new assault at that place; and

[Giraldus has left us a minute picture of Strongbow. "The countenance of the renowned adventurer," he tells us, "was feminine and his voice was thin; he was gentle and courteous in his manners; what he could not gain by force he gained by address; in peace he was more ready to obey than command; when not in battle was more a soldier than a general, in battle more a general than a soldier; always took his companions into counsel and undertook no enterprise without their advice; in action was the sure rallying point of his troops; and of unshaken constancy in either fortune or war, neither to be disturbed by adversity nor thrown off his balance by success."]

having hewed down the posts whereupon the house stood, the same fell down, together with a piece of the town wall; and then, a way being thus opened, they entered into the city, and killed the people in the streets without pity or mercy, leaving them lying in great heaps; and thus, with bloody hands, they obtained a bloody victory." MacMurrough arrived along with Fitz-Gerald and Fitz-Stephen while the work of plunder and carnage was still proceeding; and it was in the midst of the desolation which followed the sacking of the miserable city that, in fulfilment of his compact with Strongbow, the marriage ceremony was solemnised between his daughter Eva and that nobleman.

Immediately after this they again spread their banners, and set out on their march for Dublin. The inhabitants of that city, who were mostly of Danish race, had taken the precaution of stationing troops at different points along the common road from Waterford; but Dermot led his followers by another way among the mountains, and, to the consternation of the citizens, made his appearance before the walls ere they were aware that he had left Waterford. A negotiation was attempted, but, while it was still going on, Raymond and his friend, Miles or Milo de Cogan, "more willing to purchase honour in the wars than gain it in peace, with a company of lusty young gentlemen, suddenly ran to the walls, and, giving the assault, brake in, entered the city, and obtained the victory, making no small slaughter of their enemies."

Leaving Dublin in charge of Milo de Cogan, Strongbow next proceeded, on the instigation of Dermot, to invade the district of Meath, anciently considered the fifth province of Ireland, and set apart as the peculiar territory of the supreme sovereign, but which King Roderick had lately made over to his friend O'Rourke. The Anglo-Norman chief, although he seems to have met with no resistance from the inhabitants, now laid it waste from one end to the other. While all this was going on, the only effort in behalf of his crown or his country that Roderick is recorded to have made was the sending a rhetorical message to MacMurrough, commanding him to return to his allegiance and dismiss his foreign allies, if he did not wish that the life of his son, whom he had left in pledge, should be sacrificed. To this threat MacMurrough at once replied that he never would desist from his enterprise until he had not only subdued all Connaught, but won to himself the monarchy of all Ireland. Infuriated by this defiance, the other savage instantly gave orders to cut off MacMurrough's son's head.

But now the adventurers were struck on a sudden with no little perplexity by the arrival of a proclamation from King Henry, prohibiting the passing of any more ships from any port in England to Ireland, and commanding all his subjects now in the latter country to return from thence before Easter, on pain of forfeiting all their lands and being forever banished from the realm. A consultation being held in this emergency, it was resolved that Raymond le Gros should be despatched to the king, who was in Aquitaine, with letters from Strongbow reminding Henry that he had taken up the cause of Dermot MacMurrough (as he conceived) with the royal permission; and acknowledging for himself and his companions that whatever they had acquired in Ireland, either by gift or otherwise, they considered not their own, but as held for him their liege lord, and as being at his absolute disposal. The immediate effect of the proclamation was to deal a heavy blow at their cause, by the discouragement it spread among their adherents, and by cutting off the supplies both of men and victuals they had counted upon receiving from England.

Things were in this state when a new enemy suddenly appeared—a body of

[1171 A.D.]

Danes and Norwegians brought to attack the city of Dublin by its former Danish ruler, who had made his escape when it was lately taken, and had been actively employed ever since in preparing and fitting out this armament. They came in sixty ships, and as soon as they had landed proceeded to the assault. "They were all mighty men of war," says the description of them in Giraldus,¹ "and well appointed after the Danish manner." The attack was made upon the east gate of the city, and Milo de Cogan soon found that the small force under his command could make no effective resistance. But the good fortune that had all along waited upon him and his associates was still true to them. His brother, seeing how he was pressed, led out a few men by the south gate, and attacking the assailants from behind, spread such confusion through their ranks, that after a short effort to recover themselves they gave way to their panic and took to flight. Great numbers of them were slain, and their leader himself, being taken prisoner, so exasperated the Anglo-Norman commander when he was brought into his presence, that Milo de Cogan ordered his head to be struck off on the spot.

It would appear to have been not long after this that Dermot MacMurrough died, on which it is said that Strongbow took the title and assumed the authority of king of Leinster in right of his wife. Raymond le Gros had now also returned from Aquitaine; he had delivered the letter with which he was charged, but Henry had sent no answer, and had not even admitted him to his presence.

Meanwhile, on the side of the Irish, there was one individual, Laurence, archbishop of Dublin, who saw that the moment was favourable for yet another effort to save the country. Chiefly by his exertions, a great confederacy was formed of all the native princes, together with those of Man and the other surrounding islands, and a force was assembled around Dublin, with King Roderick as its commander-in-chief, to the number, it is affirmed, of thirty thousand men. Strongbow and Raymond and Maurice Fitz-Gerald had all thrown themselves into the city, but their united forces did not make twice as many hundreds as the enemy numbered thousands.

For the space of two months, however, the investing force appears to have sat still in patient expectation. Their hope was that want of victuals would compel the garrison to surrender; and at length a message came from Strongbow, and a negotiation was opened; but before any arrangement was concluded an extraordinary turn of fortune suddenly changed the whole position of affairs. While the besieged were anxiously deliberating on what it would be best for them to do, Donald Kavanagh, a son of the late king Dermot, contrived to make his way into the city, and informed them that their friend, Fitz-Stephen, was besieged by the people of Wexford in his castle of Carrig, near that place, and that if not relieved within a few days he would assuredly, with his wife and children and the few men who were with him, fall into the hands of the enemy.

Fitz-Gerald proposed and Raymond seconded the gallant counsel that, rather than seek to preserve their lives with the loss of all besides, they should make a bold attempt to cut their way to their distressed comrades, and at the worst, die like soldiers and knights. The animating appeal nerved every heart. With all speed each man got ready and buckled on his armour, and the little band was soon set in array in three divisions. All things being thus arranged, about the hour of nine in the morning they suddenly rushed forth from one of the gates and threw themselves upon the vast throng of the enemy, whom their sudden onset so bewildered and confounded that, while many were killed or thrown to the ground, the bold assailants scarcely encountered

[1171 A.D.]

any resistance, and in a short time the scattered host was flying before them in all directions. King Roderick himself escaped with difficulty, and almost undressed, for he had been regaling himself with the luxury of a bath. Great store of victuals, armour, and other spoils was found in the deserted camp, with which the victors returned at night to the city, and there set everything in order, and left a garrison well provided with all necessities, before setting out the next morning to the relief of their friends at Wexford.

The earl and his company marched on unopposed till they came to a narrow pass in the midst of bogs, in a district called the Odrone or Idrone. Here they found the way blocked up by a numerous force, but after a sharp action, in which the Irish leader fell, they succeeded in overcoming this hindrance, and were enabled to pursue their journey. They had nearly reached Wexford when intelligence was received that Fitz-Stephen and his companions were in the hands of the enemy. After standing out for several days against the repeated attacks of three thousand men he and those with him, consisting of only five gentlemen and a few archers, had been induced to deliver up the fort on receiving an assurance, solemnly confirmed by the oaths of the bishops of Kildare and Wexford, and others of the clergy, that Dublin had fallen, and that the earl with all the rest of their friends there were killed. They promised Fitz-Stephen that if he would surrender they would conduct him to a place of safety, and secure him and his men from the vengeance of King Roderick. But as soon as they had got possession of their persons, "some," according to Giraldus, "they killed, some they beat, some they wounded, and some they cast into prison." Fitz-Stephen himself they carried away with them to an island called Beg-Eri, or Little Erin, lying not far from Wexford, having fled thither, after setting that town on fire, when they heard that Strongbow had got out of Dublin and was on his march to their district. They now sent to inform the earl that if he continued his approach they would cut off the heads of Fitz-Stephen and his companions. Deterred by this threat, Strongbow deemed it best to turn aside from Wexford, and to take his way to Waterford.

KING HENRY IN IRELAND

Meanwhile it had been determined to make another application to Henry, and Hervey of Mountmaurice had been despatched to England for that purpose. On reaching Waterford, Strongbow found Hervey there, just returned, with the king's commands that the earl should repair to him without delay. He and Hervey accordingly took ship. As soon as they landed they proceeded to where Henry was, at Newnham, in Gloucestershire. He had returned from the Continent about two months before, and had ever since been actively employed in collecting and equipping an army and fleet, and making other preparations for passing over into Ireland. When Strongbow presented himself he at first refused to see him; but after a short time he consented to receive his offers of entire submission. It was agreed that the earl should surrender to the king in full possession the city of Dublin, and all other towns and forts which he held along the coast of Ireland; on which condition he should be allowed to retain the rest of his acquisitions under subjection to the English crown. This arrangement being concluded, the king, attended by Strongbow and other lords, embarked at Milford. His force consisted of five hundred knights or gentlemen, and about four thousand common soldiers. He landed at a place now called the Crook, near Waterford, on the 18th of October, 1171.

In the short interval that had elapsed since the departure of Strongbow, another attack had been made upon Dublin by Tiernan O'Rourke; but the

[1171-1175 A.D.]

forces of the Irish prince were dispersed with great slaughter in a sudden sally by Milo de Cogan. This proved the last effort for the present of Irish independence. When the English king made his appearance in the country he found its conquest already achieved, and nothing remaining for him to do except to receive the eagerly offered submission of its various princes and chieftains.

The first that presented themselves were the citizens of Wexford, who had so treacherously obtained possession of the person of Fitz-Stephen; and they endeavoured to make a merit of this discreditable exploit—bringing their prisoner along with them as a rebellious subject, whom they had seized while engaged in making war without the consent of his sovereign. Before Henry removed from Waterford, the king of Cork, Desmond, came to him of his own accord, and took his oath of fealty. From Waterford he proceeded with his army to Lismore, and thence to Cashel, near to which city, on the banks of the Suir, he received the homage of the other chief Munster prince, the king of Thomond or Limerick. The prince of Ossory and the other inferior chiefs of Munster hastened to follow the examples of their betters; and Henry, after receiving their submission, and leaving garrisons both in Cork and Limerick, returned through Tipperary to Waterford.

Soon after, leaving Robert Fitz-Bernard in command there, he set out for Dublin. Wherever he stopped on his march, the neighbouring princes and chiefs repaired to him and acknowledged themselves his vassals. Among them was Tiernan O'Rourke. "But Roderick, the monarch," it is added, "came no nearer than to the side of the river Shannon, which divideth Connaught from Meath, and there Hugh de Lacy and William Fitz-Aldelm, by the king's commandment, met him, who, desiring peace, submitted himself, swore allegiance, became tributary, and did put in (as all others did) hostages and pledges for the keeping of the same. Thus was all Ireland, saving Ulster, brought in subjection." After this Henry kept his Christmas in Dublin, the feast being held in a temporary erection, constructed after the Irish fashion, of wicker work, while the Irish princes, his guests, were astonished at the sumptuousness of the entertainment.

Henry remained in Ireland for some months longer, and during his stay called together a council of the clergy at Cashel, at which a number of constitutions or decrees were passed for the regulation of the church and the reform of the ecclesiastical discipline in regard to certain points where its laxity had long afforded matter of complaint and reproach. He is also said, by Matthew Paris,¹⁰ to have held a lay council at Lismore, at which provision was made for the extension to Ireland of the English laws. Henry employed all his arts of policy to attach Raymond le Gros and the other principal English adventurers settled in Ireland to his interest, that he might thereby the more weaken the earl of Pembroke and strengthen himself.

At last, about the middle of Lent, ships arrived both from England and Aquitaine, and brought such tidings as determined the king to lose no time in again taking his way across the sea. So, having appointed Hugh de Lacy to be governor of Dublin, and, as such, his chief representative in his realm of Ireland, he set sail from Wexford at sunrise on Easter Monday, the 17th of April, 1172, and about noon of the same day landed at Portfinnan, in Wales.

The appearances of entire submission which had been exhibited during Henry's stay in the island were not long preserved after he left its shores. Before the close of the year 1172 the people had risen against the English domination in various districts; and for the next three years De Lacy, Strongbow, and their associates were kept in constant activity by the active or

[1175-1189 A.D.]

passive resistance of one part of the country or another. In 1175 Henry, in the hope that it might have some effect in subduing this rebellious temper, produced for the first time the bull which he had procured from Pope Adrian twenty-four years before, along with a brief confirming it, which he had received in the interval from Alexander III. William Fitz-Aldelm, and Nicholas, prior of Wallingford, were sent over to Ireland with the two instruments;

and they were publicly read in a synod of bishops which these commissioners summoned on their arrival. In this same year, also, a formal treaty was concluded between Henry and Roderick O'Connor, by which the former granted to the latter, who was styled his liegeman, that so long as he continued faithfully to serve him, he should be king of the country under him and enjoy his hereditary territories in peace on payment of the annual tribute of a merchantable hide for every tenth head of cattle killed in Ireland.

For some years after this one chief governor rapidly succeeded another, as each either incurred the displeasure of the king by the untoward events of his administration, or, as it happened in some cases, awakened his jealousy by seeming to have become too popular or too powerful. But Henry never himself returned to Ireland. At length, in 1185, he determined to place at the head of the government his youngest son, John, then only in his nineteenth year; the lordship of Ireland, it is said, being the portion of his dominions which he had always intended that John should inherit. But this experiment succeeded worse than any other he had tried. The



LISMORE CASTLE, WATERFORD

same evil dispositions which were afterwards more conspicuously displayed on the throne, showed themselves in John's conduct almost from the first day he began to exercise his delegated authority; by his insulting behaviour he converted into enemies those of the Irish chieftains who had hitherto been the most attached friends of the English interest; and he met with nothing but loss and disgrace in every military encounter with the natives. He was hastily recalled by Henry after having been only a few months in the country. The government was then put into the hands of John de Courcy, who had some years before penetrated into Ulster and established the English power for the first time in that province. De Courcy remained governor to the end of the reign of Henry.^k

HENRY II'S POLICY IN IRELAND

Let us consider the position of Henry II as regards Ireland. The first Norman adventurers had submitted to hold as his vassals the lands they had received by right from King Dermot, and also those which they claimed by

[1170-1189 A.D.]

inheritance. The Irish chiefs had taken an oath of fealty, by virtue of which, in the king's opinion at least, they held the tribe lands as vassals upon the terms of feudal tenure. Remark how different was the king's conduct to each of these classes. He treated the Normans with insolence and distrust in the hour of their sorest need; he called upon their followers to abandon them, and cut off all supplies from England; he compelled Strongbow upon his knees to ask for pardon; he deprived him of Dublin and the surrounding districts; he threw into chains Fitz-Stephen, the first adventurer, and received him into favour again only upon the terms of his surrendering Wexford and the adjoining country. Against the Irish chiefs, on the other hand, he waged no war; he deprived none of them of their estates, and he sought in Dublin to dazzle them by his pomp, as he had previously intimidated them by his power. It is evident that the Normans, and not the Irish, were the objects of his fears. He dreaded the establishment of a Norman monarchy rather than the maintenance of Irish nationality; and his apprehensions were well founded, for those who in Ireland subsequently strove to establish themselves in independence of the king were not Celts but Normans. The De Courcy, De Lacy, De Burgh, and the two families of Fitzgeralds were the most active enemies of the English crown.

For some reason, of which we are ignorant, Henry II suddenly abandoned the policy he had at first adopted and pursued one altogether different. It may be that the renewal of the war upon his return to England proved to him that his first design could not be executed. For the Norman adventurers to halt was equivalent to destruction; their safety depended upon continued aggression. The Irish chiefs had bowed before the first display of force as reeds before a blast; they yielded because they believed the king's force to be irresistible; when this force was withdrawn they returned to their former independence; they were ignorant how ineffective a feudal army must prove in an uncultivated and rude country; they had miscalculated the force of the invader and underrated their own powers of resistance; they had submitted to King Henry as to the many usurpers who for the last century and a half had occupied the throne of Ireland, simply because he was the more powerful. When his power was removed they were remitted to their original position.

It may be that the king was overpowered by the pressing instance of fresh adventurers and favourites, whom he sought to provide for in a manner wholly inexpensive. Whatever be the cause, he identified the English government with the party of the Norman invaders, and sought for the sovereignty of Ireland no longer by conciliation but by conquest; but in so doing he took care not to increase the already threatening power of the first colonists; he granted out the country to fresh adventurers, who undertook to conquer and



INTERIOR OF HOLY CROSS ABBEY
Founded in 1184

[1171-1189 A.D.]

occupy it at their own expense, but as his subjects. He possessed an apparent title by gift of the pope and the submission of the inhabitants—a title which he was utterly unable to enforce; they offered in exchange for lands which the king did not possess, to wage war and extend his dominions; but the peculiarity of the transaction was that the king did not profess to confer lands which had been forfeited to him in consequence of the treason of their owners, or which lay waste and unoccupied; the existence of the Irish people was absolutely ignored, and estates were granted as if there had been no owners. A proceeding identical with this were the grants by the English crown of tracts of lands in America to English adventurers. This arrangement was peculiarly advantageous to the crown: if the adventurers succeeded, the English kingdom was extended; if they failed, so much the worse for them, and in a subsequent year fresh grants would be made to new speculators.

THE FEUDAL SYSTEM IN IRELAND

We have, in theory at least, and in view of strict English law, a complete feudal system established in Ireland; at the top stood the king, at the bottom the lowest vassal, and this legalised form of society presented a consistent form. But the feudal system as established in Ireland differed in important respects from that existing in England. It is usual for Irish writers to attribute much of the sufferings of Ireland to the misgovernment of England and the introduction of feudalism, whereas most of these evils may be referred rather to English non-government and to the peculiar anomalies of the Irish feudal system. The feudal system as introduced into Ireland, like most other institutions imported from England, was altered in such a manner as



ROMAN TOWER, KILDARE

to retain all its evils and lose all its advantages. The crown in Ireland possessed no power of controlling its vassals. When William the Conqueror distributed the lands of England, he retained in his own hands a larger proportion of manors than he granted to any of his followers. He thus became himself the most powerful feudal lord in the country. In Ireland there were no manors or valuable estates that the crown could appropriate—the entire country had to be conquered; and as the crown did not assist in the conquest,

[1171-1189 A.D.]

it received no part of the spoils. Thus we find the crown had absolutely no demesnes of its own, and, being deprived of any military force of its own, it had to rely upon such of the great feudal vassals as might remain loyal for the purpose of crushing those who might be in rebellion. The inevitable result of this policy was to kindle a civil war and excite personal feuds in the attempt to maintain order.

Thus the feudal system in Ireland was deprived of the only force which could keep it in regular and harmonious working; like a machine without a fly-wheel, its movements became uncontrolled and irregular. It was, however, possible that the several grantees of large tracts of land from the crown should have established themselves like petty princes, and occupied a position resembling that of the great vassals of the German emperor; but the jealousy of the crown towards its Norman vassals prevented this result. We have thus a feudal system, in which the crown is powerless to fulfil its duties, yet active in preventing the greater nobles from exercising that influence which might have secured a reasonable degree of order. The whole energy of the nobles was turned away from government to war; and lest they should become local potentates, they were allowed to degenerate into local tyrants.

The remarkable point in the conquest was, that the Celtic population was not driven back upon any one portion of the kingdom, but remained as it was, interpolated among the new arrivals. The distribution of the two populations may be briefly sketched as follows: The Normans occupied, in considerable force, the counties of Antrim and Down, in Ulster; in Leinster, the counties of Louth, Meath, Dublin, Kildare, and the greater portion of Westmeath, were densely colonised by Normans and Saxons; southward, the colonists occupied, in a narrow line, portions of the King's and Queen's counties, and Carlow; they held the counties of Kilkenny and Wexford, and the eastern part of Munster; they occupied Limerick and the adjoining districts, and their castles extended to the mouth of the Shannon. In Connaught, the territories of the De Burghs stretched from Galway northward and eastward over the plain portion of Connaught, and communicated through Athlone with their countrymen in Leinster. On the other hand, the residue of Ulster was occupied by the O'Neills and O'Donells, and their subordinate tribes. South of them extended the districts of the O'Farrells, the O'Reillys, and O'Rourke. In Leinster, the O'Tooles and O'Brynes occupied the mountains of Wicklow, and the Carlow and Kilkenny hills were in the hands of various tribes, of which the chief was the McMurroughs, subsequently known as Kavanaghs. The west of Munster was strongly held by the MacCarthy's and their subordinate tribes; Clare was occupied by the O'Briens; the western coast beyond Lough Corrib remained in the possession of the O'Flahertys, and the northeast of Connaught was under the control of the O'Connors.'





CHAPTER II

IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE

The original source of the calamities of Ireland was the partial character of the Norman conquest, which caused the conquerors, instead of becoming an upper class, to remain a mere hostile settlement. The next great source of mischief was the disposition of Christendom at the period of the Reformation, and the terrible religious wars which ensued. Then Ireland became a victim to the attempt of Louis XIV to destroy the liberty and religion of England through his vassals, the House of Stuart. Finally the French Revolution, breaking out into anarchy, massacre, and atheism, at the moment when England under Pitt had entered on the path of reform and toleration, not only arrested political progress, but involved Ireland in another civil war.—GOLDWIN SMITH. P

IRELAND AFTER THE DEATH OF HENRY II

DURING his brother's reign John's viceroy was William Marshal, earl of Pembroke, who married Strongbow's daughter by Eva, and thus succeeded to his claims in Leinster. John's reputation was no better in Ireland than in England. He thwarted or encouraged the Anglo-Normans as best suited him, but on the whole they increased their possessions. In 1210 the excommunicated king visited Ireland again, and being joined by Cathal Crovderg O'Connor, king of Connaught, marched almost unchallenged by De Lacy from Waterford by Dublin to Carrickfergus. Thus, with the aid of Irish allies, did Henry II's son chastise the sons of those who had given Ireland to the crown. John did not venture farther west than Trim, but most of the Anglo-Norman lords swore fealty to him, and he divided the partially obedient districts into twelve counties—Dublin (with Wicklow), Meath (with Westmeath), Louth, Carlow, Kilkenny, Wexford, Waterford, Cork, Limerick, Kerry, and Tipperary. John's resignation of his kingdom to the pope in 1213 included Ireland, and thus for the second time was the papal claim to Ireland formally recorded.

During Henry III's long reign the Anglo-Norman power increased, but underwent great modifications. Richard, earl marshal, grandson of Strongbow, and to a great extent heir of his power, was foully murdered by his own feudatories—men of his own race; and the colony never quite recovered this blow. On the other hand the De Burghs, partly by alliance with the Irish, partly

[1216-1314 A.D.]

by sheer hard fighting, made good their claims to the lordship of Connaught, and the western O'Connors henceforth play a very subordinate part in Irish history. Tallage was first imposed on the colony in the first year of this reign, but yielded little, and tithes were not much better paid.

On the 14th of January, 1217, the king wrote from Oxford to his justiciary, Geoffrey de Marisco, directing that no Irishman should be elected or preferred in any cathedral in Ireland, "since by that means our land might be disturbed, which is to be deprecated." This order was annulled in 1224 by Honorius III, who declared it destitute of all colour of right and honesty. Some enlightened men strove to fuse the two nations together, and the native Irish, or that section which bordered on the settlements and suffered great oppression, offered 8,000 marks to Edward I for the privilege of living under English law. The justiciary supported their petition, but the prelates and nobles refused to consent.

There is a vague tradition that Edward I visited Ireland about 1256, when his father ordained that the prince's seal should have regal authority in that country. A vast number of documents remain to prove that he did not neglect Irish business. Yet this great king cannot be credited with any specially enlightened views as to Ireland. Hearing with anger of enormities committed in his name, he summoned the viceroy D'Ufford to explain, who coolly said that he thought it expedient to wink at one knave cutting off another, "whereat the king smiled and bade him return to Ireland." The colonists were strong enough to send large forces to the king in his Scotch wars, but as there was no corresponding immigration this really weakened the English, whose best hopes lay in agriculture and the arts of peace, while the Celtic race waxed proportionally numerous.^b

EDWARD BRUCE IN IRELAND

Ireland, in the reign of Edward II, was divided between two races of men, of different language, habits, and laws, and animated with the most deadly hatred towards each other. The more wild and mountainous districts, and the larger portions of Connaught and Ulster, were occupied by the natives; the English or Anglo-Irish had established themselves along the eastern and southern coasts, and in all the principal cities and towns.

They professed fealty to the English crown; but their fealty was a mere sound. At pleasure they levied war on each other, or on the natives; and except in the vicinity of Dublin, the seat of provincial government, the Pale was divided among a multitude of petty tyrants, who knew no other law than their own interests. The natives within the Pale they reduced to a state of the most abject villainage; those without they harassed with military expeditions. The murder of a native was not considered a crime punishable by law; and the man who had inflicted the most cruel injury on the neighbouring septs was the most distinguished among his fellows.¹

On the other side, the descendants of the original inhabitants were equally lawless. We find them perpetually engaged in dissension and warfare. Sometimes they are fighting among themselves, sometimes against their oppressors. Occasionally we see them purchasing the aid of the English, that they may revenge themselves on their own countrymen; occasionally marching under the banners of an English baron, to invade the domains of his neighbour.

¹ On this account Irishmen frequently procured from the king charters, investing them with the character and the rights of Englishmen. To some these grants were made only for life; often they extended to whole septs and their posterity forever.

[1314-1316 A.D.]

When Edward II, before his expedition into Scotland, had ordered his vassals to meet him at Berwick, he had also written to the chiefs of the Irish septs, requesting them to accompany De Burgh, the earl of Ulster, who had been commanded to lead an army to his assistance. This request was neglected. By the Irish the efforts of the Scots were viewed with a kindred feeling. The patriots were fighting against the same nation by which they had been so cruelly oppressed. They were of the same lineage, spoke a dialect of the same tongue, and retained in many respects the same national institutions.

When intelligence arrived of the victory at Bannockburn, it was received with enthusiasm, and the conviction that the English were not invincible



CARRICKFERGUS CASTLE

awakened a hope that Ireland might recover her independence. Edward II discovered that an active correspondence was carried on between the men of Ulster and the court of Bruce. Alarmed for the safety of his Irish dominions, he despatched Lord Ufford, with instructions to treat with the native chieftains, the tenants of the crown, and the corporations of the boroughs; but before that nobleman could execute his commission Edward Bruce, the brother of the king of Scots, with an army of six thousand men had landed in the neighbourhood of Carrickfergus. He was immediately joined by the O'Neills, who directed his march. They burned Dundalk; the greater part of Louth was laid desolate; and at Athcrdec the inhabitants, men, women, and children, who had crowded into the church, perished in the flames. But the approach of Sir Edmund Butler the lord-justice, and of Richard de Burgh, earl of Ulster, warned the confederates to return. They retired to Conyers, left their banners flying in their camp, and making a short circuit, fell on the rear of their pursuers. A fierce encounter took place; the Anglo-Irish were dispersed, and Bruce continued his retreat.

During this interval a new envoy arrived from King Edward, John de Hotham, afterwards bishop of Ely, invested with extraordinary powers, to reconcile the barons, and to treat with the natives. But Bruce had now obtained a reinforcement from Scotland; he penetrated as far as Kildare, defeated the Anglo-Irish at Ardsclull, in that county, and as he returned, obtained a second victory at Kenlis, in Meath. His presence animated the Irish of Leinster. The O'Tooles, O'Briens, O'Carrolls, and Archbolds were instantly in arms; Arklow, Newcastle, and Bree were burned; and the open country presented one continued scene of anarchy and devastation.

[1316-1317 A. D.]

It is probable that in these inroads the Scots suffered many severe losses. They returned to their former quarters in Ulster, and sent again to Scotland for succours. But at the same time a treaty was concluded between Edward Bruce and Donald O'Neill, called in Edward's writs prince of Tyrone, but who styled himself hereditary monarch of Ireland. By letters patent the rights of O'Neill were transferred to Bruce, who was immediately crowned, and entered on the exercise of the regal power. But his inactivity abandoned to destruction the different septs that had joined him during his late expedition. Two hundred of the natives perished under O'Hanlon at Dundalk; three hundred were slain in Munster; four hundred fell in a battle at Tullagh; and eight hundred heads of the O'Moores were sent by the lord justice Butler to Dublin as the proof of his victory. From these losses Ireland might have risen; but her hopes were extinguished in the sanguinary field of Athenry, where Phelim O'Connor, the king of Connaught, attacked the Anglo-Irish under Lord Richard Bermingham. The natives, in a confused mass, rushed on a resolute and disciplined enemy; the battle or slaughter lasted from dawn till sunset; and among eleven thousand dead bodies were found those of Phelim himself, and of twenty-nine subordinate chieftains of the same name. The sept of the O'Connors was nearly extinguished.

To balance the exultation caused by this victory, intelligence was brought to Dublin that Robert Bruce, the king of Scotland, had landed with a numerous army in Ulster. The Anglo-Irish garrison of Carrickfergus, after a most obstinate defence, was compelled to surrender. The two brothers, at the head of twenty thousand men, Scots and Irish, advanced into the more southern counties; and the citizens of Dublin were compelled to burn the suburbs for their own protection. But the Scots, unprepared to besiege the place, ravaged the country. They successively encamped at Leixlip, Naas, and Callen; and at last penetrated as far as the vicinity of Limerick. But it was the depth of winter; numbers perished through want, fatigue, and the inclemency of the season; and the English had assembled an army at Kilkenny to intercept their return. With difficulty the Bruces eluded the vigilance of the enemy, and retired into Ulster. It is not easy to assign the reason of this romantic expedition, undertaken at such a season, and without any prospect of permanent conquest. To the Scots it was more destructive than a defeat; and Robert Bruce, dissatisfied with his Irish expedition, hastened back to his native dominions.

But notwithstanding the severe defeats which the natives had suffered, the flame of patriotism was kept alive by the exhortations of many among the clergy. The English government complained of their conduct to the papal court; and John XXII commissioned the archbishops of Dublin and Cashel to admonish those who fomented the rebellion, and to excommunicate all who should persist in their disobedience.

This commission created a deep sensation among the septs. A justification of their conduct was signed by O'Neill and the majority of the chieftains. The important instrument begins by stating that during forty centuries Ireland had been governed by its own monarchs of the race of Milesius, till the year 1170, when Adrian IV, an Englishman, conferred against all manner of right the sovereignty of the island on Henry II, the murderer of St. Thomas, whom for that very crime he ought rather to have deprived of his own crown.¹

After this introduction it argues that the original grant is become void,

¹ It is singular that they were not aware of the anachronism in making Adrian live after the murder of the archbishop, though he died twelve years before it.

[1317-1318 A.D.]

because none of the conditions on which it was made have been fulfilled. Henry had promised for himself and his successors to protect the church, and yet they had despoiled it of one-half of its possessions; to establish good laws, and they had enacted others repugnant to every notion of justice;¹ to extirpate the vices of the natives, and they had introduced among them a race of men more wicked than existed in any other country upon earth; men whose rapacity was insatiable, who employed indifferently force or treachery to effect their purposes, and who publicly taught that the murder of an Irishman was not a crime.

It was to free themselves from the oppression of these tyrants that they had taken up arms; they were not rebels to the king of England, for they had never sworn fealty to him; they were freemen waging mortal war against their foes, and for their own protection they had chosen Edward de Bruce, earl of Carrick, for their sovereign. The pope wrote to the king and commissioned his legates to speak to him in favour of the Irish. Urged by their repeated remonstrances, Edward attempted to justify himself by declaring that if they had been oppressed it was without his knowledge, and contrary to his intention; and promised that he would take them under his protection, and make it his care that they should be treated with lenity and justice.

This promise was hardly given before the war in Ireland was terminated. Sir Roger Mortimer had been intrusted with the government (1318), and during the year of his administration, though it was not distinguished by any signal victory, he had gradually confirmed the superiority of the English. The barons accused of favouring the Scots, particularly the Lacys, were attainted; De Burgh, the earl of Ulster, who had been imprisoned by the officious loyalty of the citizens of Dublin, was released; and the O'Briens and Archbolds were received to the king's peace. The men of Connaught by their dissensions aided the cause of their enemies; and no less than eight thousand of them are said to have perished in civil war.

Soon after the departure of Mortimer, Edward Bruce advanced to the neighbourhood of Dundalk. He was met by Sir John de Bermingham [with a force of Anglo-Irish more numerous than his own], and fell in battle with the greater part of his army [October 19th, 1318]. His quarters were sent, as those of a traitor, to the four principal towns; and his head was presented to Edward by Bermingham, who received the dignity and emoluments of earl of Louth as a reward. With Bruce fell the hopes of the Irish patriots; the ascendancy of the English was restored, and the ancient system of depredation and revenge universally revived. The king's attention had, however, been directed to the state of Ireland by a petition presented to him in parliament, stating that to establish tranquillity it was requisite to abolish charters of pardon for murders perpetrated by Englishmen, and that the natives, admitted to the benefit of the English law, should fully enjoy the legal protection of life and limb. Both points were granted, and it was afterwards provided that no royal officer should acquire lands within the extent of his jurisdiction, or levy purveyance, unless it were in case of necessity, with the permission of the council and under a writ from the chancery.

¹ The laws of which they chiefly complained are: (1) That though the king's courts were open to every man who brought an action against an Irishman, yet, if a native were the plaintiff, the very fact of his birth was allowed to be an effectual bar to his claim. (2) That if an Irishman was murdered, whatever were his rank in the church or state, no court would undertake to punish the murderer. (3) That no widow, if she were a native, was admitted to the claim of dower. (4) That the last wills of the natives were declared void, and their property disposed of according to the will of their lords.

[1319-1333 A.D.]

ANARCHY AND MISRULE (1319-1377 A.D.)

After the fall of Bruce, Edward II was too much occupied by his domestic enemies, and Edward III by his wars with Scotland and France, to attend to the concerns of the sister island; and the natives by successive encroachments gradually confined the English territories within narrower limits. Had the natives united in one common effort, they might have driven the invaders into the ocean; but they lost the glorious opportunity by their own dissensions and folly. Their hostilities were generally the sudden result of a particular provocation, not of any plan for the liberation of the island; their arms were as often turned against their own countrymen as against their national enemies; and several septs received annual pensions from the English government as the price of their services in protecting the borders from the inroads of the more hostile Irish.^c

John de Bermingham, earl of Louth, the conqueror of Bruce, was murdered in 1329 by the Gernons, Cusacks, Everards, and other English of that country, who disliked his firm government. They were never brought to justice. Talbot of Malahide and two hundred of Bermingham's relations and adherents were massacred at the same time. In 1333 the young earl of Ulster was murdered by the Mandevilles and others; in this case signal vengeance was taken, but the feudal dominion never recovered the blow, and on the north-east coast the English laws and language were soon confined to Drogheda and Dundalk. The earl left one daughter, Elizabeth, who was, of course, a royal ward. She married Lionel, duke of Clarence, and from her springs the



RUINS OF THE CATHEDRAL, KILDARE

royal line of England from Edward IV as well as James V of Scotland and his descendants.

The two chief men among the De Burghs were loth to hold their lands of a little absentee girl. Having no grounds for opposing the royal title to the wardship of the heiress, they abjured English law and became Irish chieftains. As such they were obeyed, for the king's arm was short in Ireland.

The two great earldoms whose contests form a large part of the history of the south of Ireland were created by Edward III. James Butler, eldest son

[1333-1364 A.D.]

of Edmund, earl of Carrick, became earl of Ormonde and palatine of Tipperary in 1328. Next year Maurice Fitzthomas Fitzgerald was made earl of Desmond, and from his three brethren descended the historic houses of the White Knight, the knight of Glyn, and the knight of Kerry. The earldom of Kildare dates from 1316.^b

THE STATUTE OF KILKENNY

The settlers in the English Pale were divided into two classes, the English by race and the English by birth. The former were the descendants of the first invaders, and considered themselves as the rightful heirs to the lands and emoluments which had been won by the swords of their progenitors. The further they were removed from their seat of government the less did they respect its authority; and as they lived in the constant violation of the English laws, naturally sought to emancipate themselves from their control. Hence many adopted the dress, the manners, the language, and the laws of the natives, and were insensibly transformed from English barons into Irish chieftains.

The English by birth comprised the persons born in England whom the king had invested with office in Ireland, and the crowds of adventurers whom penury or crime annually banished from their own country. To the old settlers they were objects of peculiar jealousy and hatred; by the government they were trusted and advanced, as a counterpoise to the disaffection of the others. Edward III had gone so far as to forbid any person to hold office under the Irish government who was not an Englishman and possessed of lands, tenements, or benefices in England; but the prohibition aroused the indignation of the English by race; in defiance of his authority they assembled in convention at Kilkenny, and so spirited were their remonstrances that he revoked the order and confirmed to them the rights which they had inherited from their ancestors.

Edward III had appointed his son Lionel, duke of Clarence, to the government of Ireland. The prince landed with an army (1361), obtained some advantages over the natives, and left the island, having rather inflamed than appeased the jealousy between the two parties. Three years later he returned; a parliament was held under his influence, and the result was the celebrated Statute of Kilkenny (1364). Its provisions were directed not against the natives, but the descendants of the English settlers who, "to the ruin of the common weal, had rejected the laws of England for those of Ireland."^c

The act contains thirty-five chapters, of which the following are the most important provisions:

Intermarriage, fosterage, gossipred, traffic, and intimate relations of any kind with the Irish were forbidden as high treason—punishment, death.

If any man took a name after the Irish fashion, used the Irish language, or dress, or mode of riding (without saddle), or adopted any other Irish customs, all his lands and houses were forfeited, and he himself was put into jail till he could find security that he would comply with the law. The Irish living among the English were permitted to remain, but were forbidden to use the Irish language under the same penalty. To use or submit to the Brehon law or to exact coyne and livery was treason. No Englishman was to make war on the Irish without the special warrant of the government, who would conduct, supply, and finish all such wars, "so that the Irish enemies shall not be admitted to peace until they be finally destroyed or shall make restitution fully of the costs and charges of that war."

[1364-1394 A.D.]

The Irish were forbidden to *booley* or pasture on those of the march lands belonging to the English; if they did so the English owner of the lands might impound the cattle as a distress for damage; but in doing so he was to keep the cattle together, so that they might be delivered up whole and uninjured to the Irish owner if he came to pay the damages.

According to Brehon law, the whole sept were liable for the offences and debts of each member. In order to avoid quarrels, the act ordains that an English creditor must sue an Irish debtor personally, not any other member of the sept. This at least was a wise provision. No native Irish clergyman was to be appointed to any position in the church within the English district, and no Irishman was to be received into any English religious house in Ireland. It was forbidden to receive or entertain Irish bards, pipers, story-tellers, or mowers, because these and such like often came as spies on the English.

The Statute of Kilkenny, though not exhibiting quite so hostile a spirit against the Irish as we find sometimes represented, yet carried out consistently the vicious and fatal policy of separation adopted by the government from the beginning. It was intended to apply only to the English, and was framed entirely in their interests. Its chief aim was to withdraw them from all contact with the "Irish enemies"—so the natives are designated all through the act—to separate the two races for evermore.

But this new law designed to effect so much was found to be impracticable, and turned out after a little while a dead letter. Coyne and livery continued to be exacted from the colonists by the three great earls, Kildare, Desmond, and Ormonde; and the Irish and English went on intermarrying, gossiping, fostering, and quarrelling on their own account, just the same as before.

The reign of Edward III was a glorious one for England abroad, but was disastrous to the English dominion in Ireland. At the very time of the battle of Crécy, the settlement had been almost wiped out of existence—not more than four counties now remained to the English. If one-half of the energy and solicitude expended uselessly in France had been directed to Ireland, which was more important than all the French possessions, the country could have been easily pacified and compacted into one great empire with England.^d

THE EXPEDITIONS OF RICHARD II

Still even after the passage of the Statute of Kilkenny the former dissensions prevailed among the Anglo-Irish, and the Irish gradually extended their conquests. To restore tranquillity, Richard in his ninth year created the earl of Oxford, his favourite, marquess of Dublin, and afterwards duke of Ireland; bestowed on him the government of Ireland for life, and granted to him and his heirs all the lands which he should conquer from the natives, with the exception of such as had already been annexed to the crown, or conferred on former adventurers. Thirty thousand marks were allotted for the expedition by parliament, and the most sanguine hopes of success were generally cherished, when the whole plan was defeated by the dissension between the king and his barons, and the subsequent exile and death of the duke.^e

In the mean time matters had been going from bad to worse in Ireland; and the native Irish had at last found a leader whose warlike genius and intrepidity made the English power in Ireland precarious indeed. This was Art McMurrough Kavanagh, or as he is more commonly called, Art McMurrough, the king of Leinster. He had married the daughter of Maurice Fitzgerald, the earl of Kildare, whereupon the English authorities had seized her lands on the ground that she had violated the Statute of Kilkenny. McMur-

rough had thereupon begun a series of raids in Wexford, Kilkenny, and Kildare. The Dublin government at length, by making concessions in regard to his "black-rent" which was in question, secured a short armistice.^a

The moment then seemed to be arrived when the English ascendancy might be restored, and the natives reduced to the most complete submission. With four thousand men-at-arms and thirty thousand archers Richard landed at Waterford; the duke of Gloucester, the earls of Rutland and Nottingham, aided him with their advice; and though the state of the country, intersected with lakes, morasses, and forests, impeded his progress; though the enemy, by retiring into inaccessible fortresses, shunned his approach; yet in a short time the idea of resistance was abandoned; the northern chieftains met the king at Drogheda, the southern attended his deputy, the earl of Nottingham, at Carlow; and all, seventy-five in number, did homage, promised to keep the peace, and submitted to pay a yearly tribute.

The four principal kings, O'Neill, O'Connor, O'Brien, and McMurrough, followed Richard to Dublin (1395), where they were instructed in the manners of the English by Sir Henry Castide, or Christal,¹ submitted to receive, though with some reluctance, the honour of knighthood, and, arrayed in robes of state, were feasted at the king's table. But a distinction was made between the natives who had not previously sworn fealty and those who had done so and rebelled, the "Irrois savages and Irrois rebels," as the king denominated them. Yet the latter on their submission were taken under protection, and obtained the promise of a full pardon on the payment of a proportionate fine. Richard, though he devoted much of his time to parade, did not neglect the reformation of the government. Grievances were redressed, the laws enforced, tyrannical officers removed, and the minds of the natives gradually reconciled to the superiority of the English.^e

Richard's second Irish expedition was undertaken in the last year of his reign, and is of more importance from its influence in English history than in Irish. It was at a moment most pregnant with danger to himself and his crown that Richard determined to leave England and cross to Ireland. His ostensible purpose was to avenge the death of his cousin and heir, Roger Mortimer, earl of March, whom he had left as his deputy in Ireland in 1395, and who had been killed in a bloody fight with McMurrough's followers in Kilkenny in 1397. But it is more than likely it was a shrinking from meeting the crisis that he must have felt was impending and a mad idea that he could avert it by the simple procedure of refusing to see it, that led him to take the step. At any rate, it was the decisive step that led to his deposition.^a

At Milford Haven Richard, having appointed his uncle, the duke of York, regent during his absence, joined his army (May 29th, 1399), and embarking in a fleet of two hundred sail, arrived in two days in the port of Waterford. His cousin, the duke of Albemarle, had been ordered to follow with a hundred more; and three weeks were consumed in waiting for that nobleman, whose delay was afterwards attributed to a secret understanding with the king's enemies. At length Richard led his forces from Kilkenny against the Irish; several of the inferior chiefs hastened barefoot, and with halters round their necks, to implore his mercy; but McMurrough spurned the idea of submission, and

¹ Castide, who gave the account of this expedition to Froissart (printed on the next page), had formerly been made prisoner by one of the natives, a powerful man, who unexpectedly leaped up behind him, embraced him tightly, and, urging the horse forward with his heels, fairly carried him off. During his captivity he had learned the Irish language, and on that account was now charged with the care of the four kings. His great difficulty was to induce them to dine at a different table from their servants, and to wear breeches, and mantles trimmed with the fur of squirrels.

[1399 A.D.]

boasted that he would extirpate the invaders. He dared not, indeed, meet them in open combat; but it was his policy to flee before them, and draw them into woods and morasses, where they could neither fight with advantage, nor procure subsistence. The want of provisions and the clamour of the soldiers compelled the king to give up the pursuit, and to direct his march towards Dublin; and McMurrough, when he could no longer impede their progress, solicited and obtained a parley with the earl of Gloucester, the commander of the rear-guard. The chieftain was an athletic man; he came to the conference mounted on a grey charger, which had cost him four hundred head of cattle, and brandished with ease and dexterity a heavy spear in his hand. He seemed willing to become the nominal vassal of the king of England, but refused to submit to any conditions. Richard set a price on his head, proceeded to Dublin, and at the expiration of a fortnight was joined by the duke of Albemarle with men and provisions. This seasonable supply enabled him to recommence the pursuit of McMurrough; but while he was thus occupied with objects of inferior interest in Ireland a revolution had occurred in England, which eventually deprived him both of his crown and his life.^c He hurried back to England, but it was too late. As Bagwell^b truly says, "but for McMurrough and his allies the house of Lancaster might never have reigned in England." No English king again visited Ireland till James II arrived there as a fugitive in 1689.

Irish Warfare in the Fourteenth Century

In the pages of Froissart's *Chronicle*^c we find a curious account of the Irish method of making war during the last years of the fourteenth century. Froissart gives it in the words of Sir Henry Castide (or Christal), from whom he says he got the information. Castide had been a prisoner in Ireland in his youth for seven years and had married while there the daughter of an Irish nobleman. Castide's comment on Richard's first expedition follows:^d

"It is not in the memory of man that any king of England ever led so large an armament of men-at-arms and archers to make war on the Irish as the present king. He remained upwards of nine months in Ireland, at great expense, which, however, was cheerfully defrayed by his kingdom; for the principal cities and towns of England thought it was well laid out, when they saw their king return home with honour. Only gentlemen and archers had been employed on this expedition; and there were with the king four thousand knights and squires and thirty thousand archers, all regularly paid every week, and so well they were satisfied.

"To tell you the truth, Ireland is one of the worst countries to make war in, or to conquer; for there are such impenetrable and extensive forests, lakes, and bogs, there is no knowing how to pass them and carry on war advantageously; it is so thinly inhabited that whenever the Irish please they desert the towns, and take refuge in these forests, and live in huts made of boughs, like wild beasts; and whenever they perceive any parties advancing with hostile dispositions, and about to enter their country, they fly to such narrow passes it is impossible to follow them.

"When they find a favourable opportunity to attack their enemies to advantage, which frequently happens, from their knowledge of the country, they fail not to seize it; and no man-at-arms, be he ever so well mounted, can overtake them, so light are they of foot. Sometimes they leap from the ground behind a horseman, and embrace the rider (for they are very strong in their arms) so tightly that he can no way get rid of them. The Irish have

pointed knives, with broad blades, sharp on both sides like a dart-head, with which they kill their enemies; but they never consider them as dead until they have cut their throats like sheep, opened their bellies, and taken out their hearts, which they carry off with them, and some say, who are well acquainted with their manners, that they devour them as delicious morsels. They never accept of ransom for their prisoners; and when they find they have not the advantage in any skirmishes, they instantly separate, and hide themselves in hedges, bushes, or holes under ground, so that they seem to disappear, no one knows whither.

"They are a very hardy race, of great subtlety, and of various tempers, paying no attention to cleanliness, nor to any gentleman—although their country is governed by kings, of whom there are several—but seem desirous to remain in the savage state they have been brought up in. True it is that four of the most potent kings in Ireland have submitted to the king of England, but more through love and good-humour than by battle or force. The earl of Ormonde, whose lands join their kingdoms, took great pains to induce them to go to Dublin, where the king our lord resided, and to submit themselves to him and to the crown of England. This was considered by every one as a great acquisition, and the object of the armament accomplished; for during the whole of King Edward's reign, of happy memory, he had never such success as King Richard. The honour is great, but the advantage little, for with such savages nothing can be done."e.

IRELAND UNDER THE THREE HENRYS

Henry IV had a bad title, and his necessities were conducive to the growth of the English constitution, but fatal to the Anglo-Irish. His son Thomas was viceroy in Ireland in 1401, but did very little. "Your son," wrote the Irish council to Henry, "is so destitute of money that he has not a penny in the world, nor can borrow a single penny, because all his jewels and his plate that he can spare, and those which he must of necessity keep, are pledged to lie in pawn." The nobles waged private war unrestrained, and the game of playing off one chieftain against another was carried on with varying success. The provisions of the statute of Kilkenny against trading with the Irish failed, for markets cannot exist without buyers.^b

After Richard II's departure Art McMurrough's raids became so intolerable that the government of Henry IV was glad to treat with him. But two years later (1401) he made a terrible raid into Wexford. This was avenged by the Dublin English, who in the following year administered a crushing defeat to the O'Briens near Bray. Again in 1405 McMurrough overran Wexford, but in 1407 the English lord deputy, Sir Stephen Scroope, utterly defeated him in Kilkenny and soon afterward suddenly fell upon his ally, O'Carroll, and slew him and eight hundred of his followers. After this defeat McMurrough was quiet for a time, but in 1413 he began his raiding again and in 1416 signally defeated the English at Wexford. This was his last exploit. He died in the next year after having been king of Leinster for forty-two years. "He was," says Joyce,^d "the most heroic, persevering, and indomitable defender of his country, from Brian Boru to Hugh O'Neill; and he maintained his independence for nearly half a century just beside the Pale, in spite of every effort to reduce him to submission."^a

The brilliant reign of Henry V was a time of extreme misery to the colony in Ireland. Half the English-speaking people fled to England, where they were not welcome. An act of Henry V ordered all "Irishmen and Irish

[1413-1459 A.D.]

clerks, beggars, called chamber deacons, to depart before the feast of All Souls, for quietness and peace in this realm of England." Irish soldiers were drawn by high pay to Henry's French wars, and a contemporary writer, Robert Redman,⁷ recounts how they "with very sharp and missile balls (*catapultariis pilis*) wounded their enemies severely, easily avoiding their onset by their own swiftness of foot."

The disastrous reign of the third Lancastrian, Henry VI, completed the discomfiture of the original colony in Ireland. Quarrels between the Ormonde and Talbot parties paralysed the government, and a Pale of thirty miles by twenty was all that remained. Even the walled towns were almost starved out; Waterford itself was half ruined and half deserted. Only one parliament was held for thirty years, but taxation was not remitted on that account. No viceroy even pretended to reside continuously. The north and west were still worse off than the south. Some thoughtful men saw clearly the danger of leaving Ireland to be seized by the first chance comer, and the *Libel of English Policy*,⁸ written about 1436, contains a long and interesting passage declaring England's interest in protecting Ireland as "a boterasse and a poste" of her own power.

Sir John Talbot, immortalised by Shakespeare, was several times viceroy; he was almost uniformly successful in the field, but feeble in council. He held a parliament at Trim which made one law against men of English race wearing moustaches, lest they should be mistaken for Irishmen, and another obliging the sons of agricultural labourers to follow their father's vocation under pain of fine and imprisonment. The Ulster annalists, *The Four Masters*,⁹ estimate the great Talbot very differently from Shakespeare—"A son of curses for his venom and a devil for his evils; and the learned say of him that there came not from the time of Herod, by whom Christ was crucified, any one so wicked in evil deeds."

IRELAND IN THE WARS OF THE ROSES

In 1449 Richard, duke of York, right heir by blood to the throne of Edward III, was forced to yield the regency of France to his rival Somerset, and to accept the Irish viceroyalty. He landed at Howth with his wife Cicely Neville, the beautiful "Rose of Raby," and Margaret of Anjou hoped thus to get rid of one who was too great for a subject. The Irish government was given to him for ten years on unusually liberal terms. He ingratiated himself with both races, taking care to avoid identification with any particular family. At the baptism of his son—"false, fleeting, perjured Clarence"—who was born in Dublin Castle, Desmond and Ormonde stood sponsors together.

The rebellion of Jack Cade, claiming to be a Mortimer and cousin to the duke of York, took place at this time. This adventurer, at once ludicrous and formidable, was a native of Ireland, and was thought to be put forward by Richard to test the popularity of the Yorkist cause. Returning suddenly to England in 1450, Richard left the government to James, earl of Ormonde and Wiltshire, who had married Lady Eleanor Beaufort, and was deeply engaged on the Lancastrian side. This earl began the deadly feud with the house of Kildare which lasted for generations. After Blore Heath Richard was attainted by the Lancastrian parliament, and returned to Dublin, where the colonial parliament acknowledged him and assumed virtual independence. A separate coinage was established, and the authority of the English parliament was repudiated. William Overy, a bold squire of Ormonde's, offered to arrest Richard as an attainted traitor, but was seized, tried before the man

whom he had come to take, and hanged, drawn, and quartered. The duke only maintained his separate kingdom about a year. His party triumphed in England, but he himself fell at Wakefield.^b

During these years a miniature War of the Roses was fought out in Ireland. The Geraldines both of Desmond and Kildare espoused the Yorkist cause; the Butlers, the adherents of the earl of Ormonde, sided with the Lancastrians. They fought not in Ireland alone, but crossed over to England, and on many a battlefield the Anglo-Irish nobility fell side by side with their English partisans. Ormonde was taken at Towton and his head long adorned London Bridge. In 1462 the two Irish factions fought at Pilltown, in Kilkenny, and the Butlers were defeated.^a

Thomas, the eighth earl of Desmond—the “great earl,” as he was called—was appointed lord deputy, in 1463, under his godson, the young duke of Clarence, the brother of Edward IV, who though appointed lord lieutenant never came to Ireland. Desmond was well received by the Irish of both races. His love for learning is shown by the fact that he founded the college of Youghal, which was richly endowed by him and his successors.

The Irish parliament passed an act in 1465 that every Irishman dwelling in the Pale was to dress and shave like the English, and take an English surname on pain of forfeiture of his goods. Another and more mischievous measure forbade ships from fishing in the seas of Irish countries, “because the dues went to make the Irish people prosperous and strong.” But the worst enactment of all was one providing that it was lawful to decapitate thieves found robbing “or going or coming anywhere” unless they had an Englishman in their company. And whoever did so, on bringing the head to the mayor of the nearest town, was licensed to levy a good sum off the barony. This put it in the power of any evil-minded person to kill the first Irishman he met, pretending he was a thief, and to raise money on his head. This, indeed, was not the intention of the legislators; the act was merely a desperate attempt to keep down marauders who swarmed at this time all through the Pale.

With all the earl of Desmond's popularity he was unable to restore tranquillity to the distracted country. He was defeated in open fight in 1466 by his own brother-in-law, O'Connor of Offaly, who took him prisoner and confined him in Carbury Castle in Kildare; from which, however, he was rescued in a few days by the people of Dublin. Neither was he able to prevent the septs from ravaging the Pale. The “great earl” was struck down in the midst of his career by an act of base treachery under the guise of law. He was first replaced in 1467 by John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester—“the Butcher,” as he was called from his cruelty—who came determined to ruin him. Acting on the secret instructions of the queen, he caused the earls of Desmond and Kildare to be arrested, and had them attainted for exacting coyne and livery, and for making alliance with the Irish, contrary to the statute of Kilkenny. Desmond was at once executed; Kildare was pardoned, and “the Butcher” returned to England, where he was himself executed soon after.^d

HENRY VII AND POYNINGS' LAW

During Richard III's short reign Garret Fitzgerald, the earl of Kildare, head of the Irish Yorkists, was the strongest man in Ireland. After the accession of Henry VII he espoused the cause of Lambert Simnel (1487),

[¹ Tiptoft was an Oxonian, and an accomplished Latin scholar. Once at Rome he made a speech in Latin that was so eloquent that it is said to have brought tears to the eyes of the great patron of letters, Pope Pius II (*Æneas Sylvius*).]

[1487-1494 A.D.]

whom the Irish in general seem always to have thought a true Plantagenet. The Italian primate, Octavian de Palatio, knew better, and incurred the wrath of Kildare by refusing to officiate at the impostor's coronation. The local magnates and several distinguished visitors attended, and Lambert was shown to the people borne aloft on "great D'Arcy of Platten's" shoulders. His enterprise ended in the battle of Stoke, where the flower of the Anglo-Irish soldiery fell. "The Irish," says Bacon, "did not fail in courage or fierceness, but, being almost naked men, only armed with darts and skeins, it was rather an execution than a fight upon them." Conspicuous among Henry's adherents in Ireland were the citizens of Waterford, who, with the men of Clonmel, Callan, Fethard, and the Butler connection generally, were prepared to take the field in his favour. Waterford was equally conspicuous some years later in resisting Perkin Warbeck, who besieged it unsuccessfully, and was chased by the citizens, who fitted out a fleet at their own charge. The king conferred honour and rewards on the loyal city, to which he gave the proud title of *urbs intacta*. Many doubtless believed that Perkin was really the duke of York; but it is now certain that he was an impostor.^b

The king now saw that his Irish subjects were ready to rise in rebellion for the house of York at every opportunity. He came to the resolution, therefore, to lessen their power by destroying the independence of their parliament; and having given Sir Edward Poynings instructions to this effect, he sent him over as deputy.

Poynings' first act was to lead an expedition to the north against O'Hanlon and Magennis, who had given shelter to some of the supporters of Warbeck. But he heard a rumour that the earl of Kildare was conspiring with O'Hanlon and Magennis to intercept and destroy himself and his army; and news came also that Kildare's brother had risen in open rebellion and had seized the castle of Carlow. On this Poynings returned south and recovered the castle.

He convened a parliament at Drogheda in November, 1494, the memorable parliament in which the act since known as Poynings' law was passed. The following are the most important provisions of this law:

(1) No parliament was in future to be held in Ireland until the Irish chief governor and privy council had sent the king information of all the acts intended to be passed in it, with a full statement of the reasons why they were required, and until these acts had been approved and permission granted by the king and privy council of England. This single provision is what is popularly known as Poynings' law.

(2) All the laws lately made in England affecting the public weal should hold good in Ireland. This referred only to English laws then existing; it gave no power to the English parliament to make laws for Ireland in the future.

(3) The Statute of Kilkenny was revived and confirmed, except the part forbidding the use of the Irish tongue, which could not be carried out, as the language was now used everywhere, even through the English settlements.

(4) For the purpose of protecting the settlement, it was made felony to permit enemies or rebels to pass through the marches; and the owners of march lands were obliged to reside on them or send proper deputies on pain of losing their estates.

(5) The exaction of coyne and livery was forbidden in any shape or form.

(6) Many of the Anglo-Irish families had adopted the Irish war-cries; the use of these was now strictly forbidden.¹

¹ The war-cry of the O'Neills was *Lamh-derg abu*, i.e., the Red-hand to victory (*lamh*, pron. lauv, a hand). That of the O'Briens and MacCarthys, *Lamh-laidir abu*, the Strong-

[1494-1534 A.D.]

In this parliament the earl of Kildare was attainted for high treason, mainly on account of his supposed conspiracy with O'Hanlon to destroy the deputy; in consequence of which he was soon afterwards arrested and sent a prisoner to England.

Up to this the Irish parliament had been independent; it was convened by the chief governor whenever and wherever he pleased; and it made its laws without any interference from the parliament of England. Now Poynings' law took away all this power and made the parliament a mere shadow, entirely dependent on the English king and council. This, indeed, was of small consequence at the time; for the parliament was only for the Pale, and no native Irishman could sit in it. But when at a later period English law was made to extend over the whole country, and the Irish parliament made laws for all the people of Ireland, then Poynings' law, which still remained in force, was felt by the people of Ireland to be one of their greatest grievances.

During the whole time that this parliament was sitting the Warbeck party were actively at work in the south. But Warbeck had at last to fly; and the rest of his career belongs to English rather than to Irish history. In 1499 he was hanged at Tyburn, with John Walter, mayor of Cork, his chief supporter in that city.^d

THE GERALDINE SUPREMACY

Henry VII now took the extraordinary step of appointing Garrett Fitzgerald, earl of Kildare, lord deputy. This man known as the "great earl" had been a foremost figure in Ireland ever since he succeeded to the earldom in 1477. He had been an ardent Yorkist and as such had espoused the cause of both the pretenders, Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck. During Poynings' lord lieutenantancy he had been attainted for high treason by the Irish parliament, and now lay a prisoner in the Tower. Nevertheless Henry determined to name him lord deputy.^a A whole crowd of enemies came forward to accuse him. He was charged with burning the church of Cashel, to which he replied that it was true enough, but that he would not have done so only he thought the archbishop was in it. The archbishop himself was present listening, and this reply was so unexpectedly plain and blunt that the king burst out laughing.

The king advised him to have the aid of counsel, saying that he might have any one he pleased; to which the earl answered that he would have the best counsel in England, namely, the king himself; at which his majesty laughed as heartily as before. At last when one of his accusers (the bishop of Meath) exclaimed with great vehemence, "All Ireland cannot rule this man!" the king ended the matter by replying, "Then if all Ireland cannot rule him, he shall rule all Ireland!"

Thus the "great earl" triumphed; and the king restored him, and made him lord deputy of Ireland (1496).^d

Hence arose the Geraldine supremacy, which, with some interruptions, lasted till 1534. So utterly perverted during this period was the government to the private purposes of the Geraldines that in consequence of a personal feud between the earl of Kildare and his son-in-law, MacWilliam of Clanricard, the royal banner was carried at the battle of Knock-Tow; in which

hand to victory (*laidir*, pron. lauder, strong). The Kildare Fitzgeralds took as their cry *Crom abu*, from the great Geraldine castle of Crom or Croom in Limerick; the earl of Desmond *Shanid abu*, from the castle of Shanid in Limerick. Most of the other chiefs, both native and Anglo-Irish, had their several cries.

[ca. 1509 A.D.]

the De Burghs, the O'Briens, MacNamaras, O'Carrolls, and other southern chiefs were defeated by the combined forces of the Pale and the O'Reillys, MacMahons, O'Farrells, O'Donells, and other northern chiefs. The Geraldines, though brave and enterprising, courteous and generous, and possessing all the qualities which insure personal popularity, were totally devoid of any of the qualities requisite for the character of a statesman, and had no higher views than the maintenance of their position as chiefs of the most powerful Irish clan.⁷

THE STATE OF IRELAND AT HENRY VIII'S SUCCESSION

To what condition was Ireland reduced by the first three centuries and a half of English rule? We shall not ourselves attempt to describe it, nor refer to any Irish author. The tale is told in the great document which stands first in the Irish State Papers of the reign of Henry VIII, "The State of Ireland, and the Plan of its Reformation."

"Who list make surmise unto the King for the reformation of his Land of Ireland, it is necessary to show him the estate of all the noble folks of the same, as well as of the King's subjects and English rebels, as of Irish enemies. And first of all to make His Grace understand that there were more than sixty counties, called Regions, in Ireland, inhabited with the King's Irish enemies; some regions as big as a shire, some more, some less, unto a little; some as big as half a shire, and some a little less; where reigneth more than sixty chief captains, whereof some calleth themselves King's, some King's peers in their language, some Princes, some Dukes, some Archdukes, that liveth, only by the sword, and obeyeth unto no other temporal person, but only to himself that is strong; and every of the said captains maketh war and peace for himself, and holdeth by the sword, and hath imperial jurisdiction within his room, and obeyeth to no other person, English or Irish, except only to such persons as may subdue him by the sword—also the son of any of the said captains shall not succeed to his father, without he be the strongest of all his nation; for there shall be none chief captain in any of the said regions by lawful succession, but by fort mayne and election; and he that hath strongest army and hardiest sword among them, hath best right and title; and by reason thereof there be but few of the regions that be in peace within themselves, but commonly rebelleth against their chief captain. Also in every of the said regions there be diverse petty captains, and every of them maketh war and peace for himself, without licence of the chief captain.

"Also, there be thirty great captains of the English folk, that followeth the same Irish order and keepeth the same rule, & every of them maketh war and peace for himself without any licence of the King or of any other temporal person, save to him that is strongest, and of such that may subdue them with the sword. Here followeth the names of the counties that obey not the King's laws, and have neither justice, neither sherriff under the King, the county of Waterford, the county of Cork, the county of Kilkenny, the county of Limerick, the county of Kerry, the county of Connaught, the county of Ulster, the county of Carlow, half the county of Uryel, half the county of Meath, half the county of Dublin, half the county of Kildare, half the county of Wexford. All English folks of the s^d counties be of Irish habits, of Irish language, and of Irish conditions, except the cities and the walled towns. Also, all the English folk of the said counties, for the more party would be right glad to obey the King's laws, if they might be defended by the King of the Irish enemies; and because they defend them not, and the King's deputy may not defend them, therefore they are all turned from the obeisance of

the King's laws, and liveth by the sword after the manner of the Irish enemies; and though that many of them obey the King's deputy, when it pleaseth them yet there is none of them all, that obeyeth the King's laws. Also, there is no folk daily subject to the King's laws, but half the county Uryel, half the county of Meath, half the county of Dublin, half the county of Kildare; and there be as many Justices of the King's Bench, and of the Common Pleas, and as many Barons of the Exchequer, and as many officers, ministers, and clerks in every of the said counties as ever there was, when all the land for the most part was subject to the laws.

"Wherefore the said subjects be so grievously vexed daily with the said Courts, that they be glad to sell their freeholds forever, rather than to suffer always the exactions of the said Courts, like as the freeholders of the marches, where the King's laws be not obeyed, be so vexed with extortion, that they be glad in likewise to sell their lands and freeholds to such persons, that compelleth them, by means of extortion, to make alienation thereof, rather than always to bear and be under the said extortion.

"And so, what with the extortion of coygne and livery daily, and with the wrongful exaction of hosting money of carriage and cartage daily, and which with the King's great subsidy yearly, and with the said tribute and black rent to the King's Irish enemies, and other infinite extortion and daily exactions, all the English folk of the counties of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Uryel, be more oppressed than any other folk of this land, English or Irish, and of worse condition be they at this side than in the marches.

"The Pandar showeth in the first chapter of his book, called *Salus Populi*,¹ that the holy woman Brigitta used to enquire of her good angel many questions of secret divine, and among all other, she enquired of what Christian land was the most souls damned? The angel showed her a land in the west part of the world. She enquired the cause why? The angel said for there the Christian folk dieth most out of charity; she enquired the cause why? The angel said, for there is most continual war, root of hate and envy, and of vices contrary to charity; and without charity the souls cannot be saved. And the angel did show to her the lapse of the souls of Christian folk of that land, how they fell down into hell as thick as any hail shower. And pity thereof moved Pandar to consign his said book, as in the said chapter plainly doth appear, for after his opinion this is the land the angel understood; for there is no land in the world of so long continued war within himself, ne of so great shedding of Christian blood, ne of so great robbing, spoiling, praying, and burning, ne of so great wrongful extortion continually as Ireland. Wherefore it cannot be denied that the angel did understand the land of Ireland.

"What might the King do more than he has done? He did conquer all the land unto little, and did inhabit the same with English folk, subject to his laws, after the manner of England, and so the land did continue and prosper 100 years and more; and since the land hath grown and increased near hand 200 years in rebellion against the king and his laws. Many folk doth enquire the cause why that the Irish folk be grown so strong, and the King's subjects so feeble, and fallen in so great rebellion for the more part.

"What pity is it to hear, what ruth is it to report, there is no tongue that can tell, no pen that can write. It passeth for the orators, and the Muses, all to show all the order of the noble folk, and how cruel they enterith the poor common people, what danger is to the king anent God, to suffer the land

[¹ Panderus was an Irish author of whom almost nothing is known save that he was the author of the book, *De Salute Populi*, and flourished in the last quarter of the fifteenth and first quarter of the sixteenth centuries.]

[ca. 1509 A.D.]

whereof he bear the charge, and the care temporal under God, under the see Apostolical, to be of said disorder, so long without remedy; it were more honour and worship to surrender his claim thereto, and to make no longer persecution thereof, than to suffer his poor subjects always to be so suppressed, and all the noble folk of the land to be at war within themselves, in shedding of Christian blood always without remedy. The herde must render account of his folk and the king for his.

"Some sayeth that the prelates of the Church and clergy is much cause of all the disorder of the land; for there is no arch-bishop, ne bishop, abbot, ne prior, parson, ne vicar, ne any other person of the Church, high or low, great or small, English or Irish, that useth to preach the word of God, saving the poor friars beggars; and where the word of God do cease, there can be no grace, and without the special [grace] of God the land may never be reformed; and by the teaching and preaching of prelates of the Church, and by prayer or orison of the devout persons in the same, God useth always to grant his abundant grace; ergo the Church not using the premises is much cause of all the said disorder of this land."

Such was the condition of Ireland after more than three centuries of English so-called government.

In the twelfth century the Irish Celts were in a state of political disorganisation, but they still had a feeling of nationality, and had the form at least of a national monarchy; and justice, criminal and civil, was administered among them according to a definite code of law.

At the commencement of the sixteenth century there remained no tradition of national unity, no trace of an organisation by which they could be united into one people; the separate tribes had been disorganised by civil wars, and the original tribesmen were supplanted and oppressed by the mercenary followers of the several rivals for the chieftaincies. The Celtic population had found the rule of England scarcely less injurious to them than the invasions of the Danes. The Anglo-Normans, thwarted in their first attempts at colonisation by the watchful jealousy of England, had been since subjected to constant injustice and oppression, and in a relapse to a lower political and social state sought for personal security and freedom and an escape from the exactions of an inefficient and corrupt executive.

Every trace of English government, save the miseries which it had caused, had passed away from Ireland. The English king had no force in Ireland, nor any ally, save the hereditary enemies of the house of Kildare. The English conquest was confessedly a failure. The Anglo-Norman colony had disappeared or been absorbed in the Celtic population. If the king of England were any longer to be lord of Ireland, the conquest of the island must be commenced again. The Irish question rose before English statesmen, Was England to hold Ireland, and if so, how? Long the Tudor princes shrunk from looking this difficulty in the face; they temporised, vacillated, and sought some middle course, some compromise. But the Irish question became at length (amid the complications of the sixteenth century) the question of English politics. England found that she must either conquer Ireland, or herself succumb in the struggle.

THE REVOLT OF LORD THOMAS FITZGERALD

When Henry VIII ascended the throne, the exercise of the royal authority in Ireland was circumscribed within the very narrow limits known as the English Pale, comprising only the principal seaports, with one-half of the

[1509-1546 A.D.]

five counties of Louth, Westmeath, Dublin, Kildare, and Wexford; the rest of the island was unequally divided among sixty chieftains of Irish, and thirty of English origin, who governed the inhabitants of their respective domains, and made war upon each other as freely and as recklessly as if they had been independent sovereigns. To Wolsey it appeared that one great cause of the decay of the English power was the jealousy and the dissension between the two rival families of the Fitzgeralds (Geraldines) and the Butlers, under their respective chiefs, the earls of Kildare and of Ormonde or Ossory. That he might extinguish or repress these hereditary feuds, he determined to intrust the government to the more impartial sway of an English nobleman, and Garrett Fitzgerald, the young earl of Kildare, son of the "great earl," who had succeeded his father, was removed from the office of lord deputy (1520), to make place for Thomas Howard, the earl of Surrey, afterwards duke of Norfolk.

During two years the English governor overawed the turbulence of the Irish lords by the vigour of his administration, and won the esteem of the natives by his hospitality and munificence. But when Henry declared war against France (1522), Surrey was recalled to take command of the army; and the government of Ireland was conferred on Butler, earl of Ormonde. Ormonde was soon compelled to resign it to Kildare; Kildare transmitted it to Sir William Skeffington, an English knight, deputy to the duke of Richmond; and Skeffington, after a short interval, replaced it in the hands of his immediate predecessor. Thus Kildare saw himself for the third time invested with the chief authority in the island, but no longer awed by the frowns of Wolsey, who had fallen into disgrace, he indulged in such acts of extravagance that his very friends attributed them to occasional derangement of intellect.

The complaints of the Butlers induced Henry to call the deputy to London (1534), and to confine him in the Tower. At his departure the reins of government dropped into the hands of his son, Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, known as "Silken Thomas," a young man in his twenty-first year, generous, violent, and brave. His credulity was deceived by a false report that his father had been beheaded, and his resentment urged him to the fatal resolution of bidding defiance to his sovereign. At the head of one hundred and forty followers he presented himself before the council on June 11th, 1534, resigned the sword of state, the emblem of his authority, and in a loud tone declared war against Henry VIII, king of England.

Cromer, archbishop of Armagh, seizing him by the hand, most earnestly besought him not to plunge himself and his family into irremediable ruin; but the voice of the prelate was drowned in the strains of an Irish minstrel who in his native tongue called on the hero to revenge the blood of his father; and the precipitate youth, unfurling the standard of rebellion, commenced his career with laying waste the rich district of Fingal.

A gleam of success cast a temporary lustre on his arms; and his revenge was gratified with the punishment of the supposed accuser of his father, Allen, archbishop of Dublin, who was surprised and put to death by the Geraldines.¹ He now sent an agent to the emperor, Charles V, to demand assistance against the man who by divorcing Catherine had insulted the honour of the imperial family, and wrote to the pope, offering to protect with his sword the interests

[¹ Lord Thomas was apparently not directly responsible for his death. The archbishop was captured by Fitzgerald's followers, but upon throwing himself on the young man's mercy received a pardon, which was not, however, respected by some Geraldine partisans, who murdered him in cold blood and pretended to have Fitzgerald's warrant for it. The crime brought a sentence of excommunication against Lord Thomas and his followers.]

[1534-1540 A.D.]

of the church against an apostate prince, and to hold the crown of Ireland of the Holy See by the payment of a yearly tribute. But fortune quickly deserted him. He was repulsed from the walls of Dublin Castle, although he secured entrance to the city; Skeffington, again appointed lord deputy, opposed to his undisciplined followers a numerous body of veterans; his own strong castle of Maynooth was carried by assault, and Lord Leonard Grey hunted the ill-fated insurgent into the fastnesses of Munster. Here by the advice of his friends he offered to submit; but his simplicity was no match for the subtlety of his opponent; he suffered himself to be deceived by assurances of pardon, dismissed his adherents, accompanied Grey to Dublin (August 20th, 1535), and thence sailed to England, that he might throw himself at the feet of his sovereign.¹

Henry was at a loss in what manner to receive him. Could it be to his honour to allow a subject to live who had taken up arms against him? But then, was it for his interest to teach the Irish that no faith was to be put in the promises of his lieutenants? He, therefore, committed young Fitzgerald to the Tower; soon afterwards Grey, who had succeeded Skeffington as lord deputy, perfidiously apprehended the five uncles of the captive at a banquet; and the year following all six, though it is said that three had never joined in the rebellion, were beheaded (February 3rd, 1537) in consequence of an act of attainder passed by the English parliament.²

Fitzgerald's father, the earl of Kildare, had already died of a broken heart, and the last hopes of the family centred in Gerald, the brother of Thomas, a boy about twelve years old. By the contrivance of his aunt he was conveyed beyond the reach of Henry, and intrusted to the fidelity of two native chieftains, O'Neill and O'Donnell. Two years later he had the good fortune to escape to the Continent, but was followed by the vengeance of King Henry, who demanded him of the king of France, and afterwards of the governor of Flanders, in virtue of preceding treaties. Expelled from Flanders, he was, at the recommendation of the pope, Paul III, taken under the protection of the prince bishop of Liege, and afterwards into the family of his kinsman, Cardinal Pole, who watched over his education and provided for his support till at length he recovered the honours and the estates of his ancestors, the former earls of Kildare.

Henry's innovations in religion were viewed with equal abhorrence by the indigenous Irish and the descendants of the English colonists. Fitzgerald, aware of this circumstance, had proclaimed himself the champion of the ancient faith; and after the imprisonment of Fitzgerald, his place was supplied by Cromer, archbishop of Armagh. On the other hand, the cause of the king was supported by a more courtly prelate, Brown, who, from the office of provincial of the Augustinian friars in England, had been raised to the archiepiscopal see of Dublin, in reward of his subserviency to the politics of Cromwell. But Henry determined to enforce submission.

A parliament was summoned by Lord Grey, who had succeeded Skeffington, and to elude the opposition of the clergy their proctors, who had hitherto voted in the Irish parliaments, were by a declaratory act pronounced

¹ Skeffington, indeed, says that he had surrendered "without condition." But that he was prevailed upon to do so by assurances of pardon is plain from the letters of the Irish council and of Norfolk, and the answer of Henry, "if he had beene apprended after suche sorte as was convenable to his deservynge, the same had beene much more thankfull, and better to our contentacion."

² A letter of Fitzgerald from the Tower states his miserable condition, and that he must have gone naked, "but that pore prysoners of ther gentylnes hathe sumtyme gevyne me old hosyn, and shoyes, and old shyrtes."

to be nothing more than assistants, whose advice might be received, but whose assent was not required. The statutes which were now passed were copied from the proceedings in England. The papal authority was abolished; Henry was declared head of the Irish church; and the first-fruits of all ecclesiastical livings were given to the king.

But ignorance of the recent occurrences in the sister island gave occasion to a most singular blunder. One day the parliament confirmed the marriage of the king with Anne Boleyn; and the next, in consequence of the arrival of a courier, declared it to have been invalid from the beginning. It was, however, more easy to procure the enactment of these statutes, than to enforce their execution. The two races combined in defence of their common faith; and repeated insurrections exercised the patience of the deputy, till his brilliant victory at Bellahoe broke the power of O'Neill, the northern chieftain, and confirmed the ascendancy of the royal cause.

This was the last service performed by Lord Grey. He was uncle by his sister to the young Gerald Fitzgerald, and therefore suspected of having connived at his escape. This, with numerous other charges from his enemies, was laid before the king; and he solicited permission to return, and plead his cause in the presence of his sovereign. The petition was granted; but the unfortunate deputy soon found himself a prisoner in the Tower, and was afterwards arraigned under the charge of treason for having aided and abetted the king's rebels. Oppressed by fear, or induced by the hope of mercy, he pleaded guilty; and his head was struck off by the command of the thankless sovereign whom he had so often and so usefully served.

After the departure of Grey, successive but partial insurrections broke out in the island. They speedily subsided of themselves; and the new deputy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, found both the Irish chieftains and the lords of the Pale anxious to outstrip each other in professions of obedience to his authority. A parliament was assembled; Ireland from a lordship was raised to the higher rank of a kingdom; Henry was declared head of the church, regulations were made for the administration of justice in Connaught and Munster; and commissioners were appointed with power to hear and determine all causes which might be brought before them from the other provinces. The peerage of the new kingdom was sought and obtained, not only by the lords who had hitherto acknowledged the authority of the English crown, but even by the most powerful of the chieftains, who, though nominally vassals, had maintained a real independence; by Ulliac de Burgh, now created earl of Clanricard; by Murrough O'Brien, made earl of Thomond; and by the redoubted O'Neill, henceforth known by his new title of earl of Tyrone. These, with the chief of their kindred, swore fealty, consented to hold their lands by the tenure of military service, and accepted from their sovereign houses in Dublin for their accommodation, as often as they should attend their duty in parliament. Never, since the first invasion of the island by Henry II, did the English ascendancy in Ireland appear to rest on so firm a basis as during the last years of Henry VIII.^e

THE IRISH CHURCH

The reign in which Protestantism and Ultramontaniam began their still unfinished struggle in Ireland is a fit place to notice the chief points in Irish church history. Less than two years before Strongbow's arrival Pope Eugenius had established an ecclesiastical constitution in Ireland depending on Rome, but the annexation was very imperfectly carried out, and the hope of

[138-1449 A.D.]

fully asserting the Petrine claims was a main cause of Adrian's gift to Henry II. Hitherto the Scandinavian section of the church in Ireland had been most decidedly inclined to receive the hierarchical and diocesan as distinguished from the monastic and quasi-tribal system. The bishops or abbots of Dublin derived their succession from Canterbury from 1038 to 1162, and the bishops of Waterford and Limerick also sought consecration there. But both Celt and Northman acknowledged the polity of Eugenius, and it was chiefly



ABBAY OF MOYNÉ, IRELAND

in the matters of tithe, Peter's pence, canonical degrees, and the observance of festivals that Rome had still victories to gain.

Between churchmen of Irish and English race there was bitter rivalry; but the theory that the ancient Patrician church remained independent, and as it were Protestant, while the English colony submitted to the Vatican, is a mere controversial figment. The crown was weak and papal aggression made rapid progress. It was in the Irish church, about the middle of the thirteenth century, that the system of giving jurisdiction to the bishops *in temporalibus* was adopted by Innocent IV. The vigour of Edward I obtained a renunciation in particular cases, but the practice continued unabated. The system of provisions was soon introduced at the expense of free election, and was acknowledged by the Statute of Kilkenny. In the more remote districts it must have been almost a matter of necessity.

Many Irish parishes grew out of primitive monasteries, but other early settlements remained monastic, and were compelled by the popes to adopt the rule of authorised orders, generally that of the Augustinian canons. That order became much the most numerous in Ireland, having not less than three hundred houses. Of other sedentary orders the Cistercians were the most important and the mendicants were very numerous. Both Celtic chiefs and Norman nobles founded convents after Henry II's time, but the latter being wealthier were most distinguished in this way. Religious houses were useful as abodes of peace in a turbulent country, and the lands attached were better cultivated than those of lay proprietors.

Ample evidence exists that the Irish church was full of abuses before the movement under Henry VIII. In Dublin strange things happened; thus the archiepiscopal crozier was in pawn for eighty years from 1449. The morals of the clergy were no better than in other countries, and we have evi-

[1515-1551 A.D.]

dence of many scandalous irregularities. Where his hand reached Henry had little difficulty in suppressing the monasteries or taking their lands, which Irish chiefs swallowed as greedily as men of English blood. But the friars, though pretty generally turned out of doors, were themselves beyond Henry's power, and continued to preach everywhere among the people. Their devotion and energy may be freely admitted; but the mendicant orders, especially the Carmelites, were not uniformly distinguished for morality.

The Jesuits, placed by Paul III under the protection of Con O'Neill, "prince of the Irish of Ulster," came to Ireland towards the end of Henry's reign, and helped to keep alive the Roman tradition. It is not surprising that Anglicanism—the gospel light that dawned from Boleyn's eyes—recommended by such prelates as Browne and Bale, should have been regarded as a symbol of conquest and intrusion. *The Four Masters*^a thus describe the Reformation: "A heresy and new error arising in England, through pride, vain glory, avarice, and lust, and through many strange sciences, so that the men of England went into opposition to the pope and to Rome." The destruction of relics and images and the establishment of a schismatic hierarchy is thus recorded: "Though great was the persecution of the Roman emperors against the church, scarcely had there ever come so great a persecution from Rome as this." Such was Roman Catholic opinion in Ireland in the sixteenth century.

EDWARD VI AND THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND

The able opportunist Sir Anthony St. Leger, who was accused by one party of opposing the Reformation and by the other of lampooning the real presence, continued to rule during the early days of the protectorate. To him succeeded Sir Edward Bellingham, a Puritan soldier whose hand was heavy on all who disobeyed his dear young master, as he affectionately called the king. He bridled Connaught by a castle at Athlone, and Munster by a garrison at Leighlin Bridge. The O'Mores and O'Connors were brought low, and forts erected where Maryborough and Philipstown now stand. Both chiefs and nobles were forced to respect the king's representative, but Bellingham was not wont to flatter those in power, and his administration found little favour in England. Sir F. Bryan, Henry VIII's favourite, succeeded him, and on his death St. Leger was again appointed. Neither St. Leger nor his successor Crofts could do anything with Ulster, where the papal primate Wauchop, a Scot by birth, stirred up rebellion among the natives and among the Hebridean invaders. But little was done under Edward VI to advance the power of the crown, and that little was done by Bellingham.

The English government long hesitated about the official establishment of Protestantism, and the royal order to that effect was withheld until 1551. Copies of the new liturgy were sent over, and St. Leger had the communion service translated into Latin, for the use of priests and others who could read, but not in English. The popular feeling was strong against innovation, as Staples, bishop of Meath, found to his cost. The opinions of Staples, like those of Cranmer, advanced gradually, until at last he went to Dublin and preached boldly against the mass. He saw men shrink from him on all sides. "My lord," said a beneficed priest, whom he had himself promoted, and who wept as he spoke, "before ye went last to Dublin ye were the best-beloved man in your diocese that ever came in it, now ye are the worst beloved. Ye have preached against the sacrament of the altar and the saints, and will make us

[1551-1556 A.D.]

worse than Jews. The country folk would eat you. Ye have more curses than ye have hairs of your head, and I advise you for Christ's sake not to preach at the Navan." Staples answered that preaching was his duty, and that he would not fail; but he feared for his life.

On the same prelate fell the task of conducting a public controversy with Primate Dowdall, which, of course, ended in the conversion of neither. Dowdall fled; his see was treated as vacant, and Cranmer cast about for a Protestant to fill St. Patrick's chair. His first nominee, Dr. Turner, resolutely declined the honour, declaring that he would be unintelligible to the people; and Cranmer could only answer that English was spoken in Ireland, though he did, indeed, doubt whether it was spoken in the diocese of Armagh. John Bale, a man of great learning and ability, became bishop of Ossory. There is no reason to doubt his sincerity, but he was coarse and intemperate—Mr. Froude roundly calls him a foul-mouthed ruffian—without the wisdom of the serpent or the harmlessness of the dove. His choice rhetoric stigmatised the dean of St. Patrick's as ass-headed, a blockhead who cared only for his kitchen and his belly. Archbishop Browne was gluttonous and a great epicure. If Staples was generally hated, what feelings must Bale have excited?^b

THE IRISH POLICY OF QUEEN MARY

Though Mary, as a Catholic, was desirous to reunite the church to the Catholic church of the Continent, to restore the ancient dogmas and ritual, as a Tudor she was unwilling to resign any prerogative of the crown, or to restore any property within her grasp. With the exception of the papal supremacy, which she rather admitted in theory than submitted to in practice, her church policy was substantially the same as that of her father. The queen professed to be most zealous on behalf of the Catholic church. How far was the spirit of her instructions actually carried out? The mass was restored by Sir Anthony St. Leger under an order in council, and the reformed bishops expelled from their sees. But beyond this, the queen had no intention of surrendering any power or title, or of restoring any of the confiscated property of the church.

The letter from the English privy council announcing her accession describes her as "*Queen of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and on earth the supreme head of the churches of England and Ireland.*" As such supreme head she appointed the new bishops; she reinstated as primate Dowdall, who had been appointed by Henry VIII, and had never obtained any bull of confirmation from the holy see, instead of Wauchop, who had been appointed by the pope to that office. The papal power of appointing by proviso was not admitted by her government. In the matter of the former property of the church, she granted it away as freely as her father or brother. Although the mass had been restored, all the acts of Henry VIII remained upon the statute book, nor was it until 1556 that parliament was required to assist in the restoration of the Catholic church. In 1555 a bull was enrolled in chancery, dated June 7th, 1555, whereby the pope absolved the king and queen from all excommunications and ecclesiastical censures and erected Ireland into a kingdom. A subsequent bull was obtained from the pope, Paul IV, to legalise the course of legislation intended to be taken with regard to the church property.

The crown, established in its possession of the estates of the monasteries, continued to make grants of them down to the end of the reign. No attempt whatsoever was made to unite the English and Irish inhabitants upon the basis of a common religious confession; the bishops under Mary were as

willing as their predecessors, under Henry VIII, to employ the powers of the church against the wild Irish.

Except the temporary establishment of the Roman ritual, the Catholic church was in no degree benefited by the accession of Mary: none of the evils which had paralyzed the action of the church before the break with Rome were remedied; none of the wounds inflicted upon that church during the reigns of Henry and Edward were cured; no attempt was made to restore the monasteries, or to re-establish and strengthen the parochial secular clergy, or to enable the church to act as an organised living body, or to unite the English and the natives in one national church: on the contrary, the confiscation of church properties was confirmed, and the undisposed-of residue of them leased out or granted away; the bishops were appointed in most instances by the crown, as in the time of Henry VIII; the contempt of high English ecclesiastics for the mere Irish was exhibited as before. When Mary died the Catholic church was a mere shadow of its former self, with its monastic element totally destroyed, and the independence of its secular members, or of such of them as still existed, crushed out. Upon the accession of Elizabeth, as an institution, it retained no elements of resistance.

The history of the reign of Mary contradicts the theory that in the sixteenth century religious differences had any connection with the conduct of the native Irish or of the English government. The accession of Mary was attended with an outbreak of some of the native chiefs who, if they believed that the hand of a Catholic sovereign would be lighter than that of Henry VIII, were soon disappointed. Catholic sovereigns thought it was necessary to enforce order in Ireland by the strong hand, as Protestant sovereigns had done before them; Catholic deputies thought themselves justified in burning villages, raiding upon native tribes, and shooting down rebels, as much as Protestant deputies had done.

The government fell back during this reign into the feeble, yet violent measures of former days. The lord-deputies neither, as St. Leger, conciliated, nor, as Bellingham, for a time at least, over-awed the native chiefs. The lord-deputy (the earl of Sussex) returned to the old system of ineffectual and exasperating raiding. Expeditions of this description were enough to undo the web of policy which Sir Anthony St. Leger had woven for years. These expeditions are always represented in official documents in the most favourable light. What the English soldiers thought of such operations may be imagined from the following passage found in the *Harleian Miscellany*: "The deputy, according to his commission, marched into the north. But, alas, he neither found France to travel in, nor Frenchmen to fight withal. There were no glorious towns to load the soldiers home with spoils, nor pleasant vineyards to refresh them with wine. Here were no plentiful markets to supply the salary of the army if they wanted, or stood in need; here were no cities of refuge, nor places of garrison to retire into in the times of danger and extremity of weather; here were no musters ordered, nor lieutenants of shires to raise new armies; here was no supplement of men or provisions, especially of Irish against Irish; nor any one promise kept according to his expectation; here were in plain terms bogs and woods to lie in, fogs and mists to trouble you, grass and fern to welcome your horses and corrupt and putrefy your bodices; here was killing of kine and eating fresh beef, to breed diseases; here was oats without bread, and fire without wood; here were smoky cabins and nasty holes; here were bogs on the tops of mountains, and few passages, but over marshes or through strange places; here was retiring into fastnesses and glens, and no fighting, but when they pleased themselves; here was ground

[1556 A.D.]

enough to bury your people in being dead, but no place to please them while alive; here you might spend what you brought with you, but be assured there was no hopes of relief; here was room for all your losses, but scarce a castle to receive your spoil and treasure. To conclude: here was all glory and virtue buried in obscurity and oblivion, and not so much as a glimmering hope that how valiantly soever a man demeaned himself it should be registered or remembered."

THE PLANTATIONS IN LEIX AND OFFALY

But if the English were weary of the tedious policy of conciliation, and raidings and plunderings did not promise to lead to a conquest of the island, there was yet a third course which might be adopted—the confiscation of the Irish districts, and their plantation by English colonists. Such a scheme, the fruitful cause of misery to Ireland ever since, was for the first time adopted by the government of Queen Mary. No Irish tribe had been the cause of such constant annoyance to the English government as the O'Connors. They, with the O'Mores, occupied the districts of Leix and Offaly in the present King's and Queen's counties. The territory they occupied was theoretically portion of the estate of the earls of Kildare. It menaced the Pale on the southwest, and on one side threatened the communications between Dublin and Kilkenny, as did the Wicklow mountaineers on the other.¹

The O'Connors had been concerned in the revolt of Lord Thomas Fitzgerald in 1534. Much of the O'Connor and O'More property was granted by the crown as a portion of the forfeited estates of the Geraldines, and their hostility to the English became more irreconcilable. Two English garrisons were planted in Leix and Offaly in the reign of Edward, and fighting was kept up without cessation. On Mary's accession the O'Mores expelled all the English from their territories.²

The queen might have remembered that the origin of the misfortunes of the O'Connors had been their supporting a rebellion which was in favour of the Catholic church, or at least professed to be so, and following as allies or vassals the head of the great Geraldine house. The queen pursued the previous English policy as to the O'Connors; but the contest was no longer to be between the natives and the royal patentees—the entire district was to be taken into the hands of the crown, to be made shire land; tribe rights, Celtic laws, language, and manners were to disappear, and the districts were to form the first English settlement or plantation.

The government intended, in the case of Leix and Offaly, to adopt a regular system of colonisation. In December, 1556, orders were given as to the county of Leix, to divide each country between the English and Irish; to appoint for the O'Mores all the country beyond the bog; that the chief of every sept (the Irish) should appoint how many of his sept he would answer for; that they should hold their lands of the fort, and should answer the laws of the realm as the English do; that the freeholders should cause their children to learn to speak English; that they should keep open the fords, destroy the fastnesses, and cut the passes; that none of them should marry or foster with any but such as should be of English blood, without license of the deputy under his handwriting, under pain of forfeiture of his estate.

As the country had not been conquered effectually, the result of this project was to introduce into these districts a body of English colonists who had to fight for the lands granted to them, and to maintain them when conquered by the strong hand. The warfare which ensued resembled that waged by the

early settlers in America with the native tribes. No mercy whatever was shown, no act of treachery was considered dishonourable, no personal tortures and indignities were spared to the captives. The atrocities of western border warfare were perpetrated year after year in these districts, and the government in Dublin acquiesced in what was done, and supported their grantees in the properties which the crown had guaranteed them. The merciless struggle went on far into Elizabeth's reign between the natives and the colonists, until the Celtic tribes, decimated and utterly savage, sunk to the level of banditti and ultimately disappeared.^f

THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH

"The absolute command of Ireland was essential for the safety of Elizabeth; for this purpose she had to satisfy or crush any chief of sufficient importance to intrigue with her continental enemies, and after 1569 to wage a constant war against the religion of the inhabitants of the country." These words of the Irish historian Richey^g serve well as a key to the history of Ireland during the reign of Elizabeth. As he points out, it was neither a desire to better the condition of the Irish people by the introduction of civilising arts and industries, or the lust of conquest for the sake of conquest and exploitation, that led the English to enter with such vigour on an undertaking that involved such an extraordinary loss of life and property. And the result, although it did, it is true, secure England for the time being from the dangers of foreign attack through Ireland, in the end involved her in further difficulty by arousing the hereditary hostility of a large part of the Irish people.^h

Sir Henry Sidney was sworn lord-justice upon Elizabeth's succession with the full Catholic ritual. When Sussex superseded him as lord-lieutenant, the litany was chanted in English, both cathedrals having been painted and Scripture texts substituted for "pictures and popish fancies." At the beginning of 1560 a parliament was held which restored the ecclesiastical legislation of Henry and Edward. In two important points the Irish church was made more dependent on the state than in England: *congrégations d'église* were abolished and heretics made amenable to royal commissioners or to parliament without reference to any synod or convocation. Elizabeth connived at what she could not prevent, and hardly pretended to enforce uniformity except in the Pale and in the large towns.

THE REVOLT OF SHANE O'NEILL

Ulster demanded the immediate attention of Elizabeth. Her father had conferred the earldom of Tyrone on Con Bacagh O'Neill, with remainder to his supposed son Matthew, the offspring of a smith's wife at Dundalk, who in her husband's lifetime brought the child to Con as his own. When the chief's legitimate son, Shane, grew up he declined to be bound by this arrangement, which the king may have made in partial ignorance of the facts. "Being a gentleman," he said, "my father never refused no child that any woman namyd to be his." When Tyrone died, Matthew, already created baron of Dungannon, claimed his earldom under the patent. Shane being chosen O'Neill by his tribe, claimed to be the chief by election and earl as Con's lawful son. Thus the English government was committed to the cause of one who was at best an adulterine bastard, while Shane appeared as champion of hereditary right. To secure his position he murdered the baron of Dungannon, whose prowess in the field he had reason to dread, and the eldest of two surviving sons be-

[1558-1567 A.D.]

came official candidate for the earldom. Shane maintained a contest which had begun under Mary until 1567, with great ability and a total absence of morality, in which Sussex had no advantage over him. The lord-lieutenant twice tried to have Shane murdered; once he proposed to break his safe-conduct; and he held out hopes of his sister's hand as a snare. Shane was induced to visit London, where his strange appearance and followers caused much amusement, and where he spent his time intriguing with the Spanish ambassador and making himself agreeable to Lord Robert Dudley. The government detained him rather unfairly, and the young baron of Dungannon suffered his father's fate, leaving a brother who at last gained the coveted earldom and became a more dangerous enemy to England than even Shane had been. Sussex was outmatched both in war and diplomacy; the loyal chiefs were crushed one by one, and the English suffered checks of which the moral effect was ruinous. Shane always fully acknowledged Elizabeth as his sovereign, and sometimes played the part of a loyal subject, wreaking his private vengeance under colour of expelling the island Scots from Ulster.^b

In Sir Henry Sidney, whom the queen sent against him in 1566, Shane found a very different antagonist from the earl of Sussex. The plan adopted for the conquest of Ulster was to restore to their several territories the chiefs expelled by The O'Neill, to assail his rear by establishing a garrison in the north, at Derry, and to support these operations by an invasion from the Pale. The power of O'Neill, founded not upon a voluntary alliance of the Ulster chiefs, but upon their compulsory subjection to the ruling house, was rapidly broken up. Harassed by attacks from every quarter, bewildered by the number of his enemies, O'Neill was unable to offer an effectual resistance. In his final struggle he attempted to rally to himself the Catholic party; but his appeal to the king of France and the cardinals of Lorraine and Guise met with no response; and deserted or assailed by the vassals who had formerly been his strength, he was forced to fight his last battle, not against the Saxon enemy, but against the ancient Celtic antagonists of his race. The battle which decided the fate of The O'Neill was fought near Lifford, between the two royal races of Ulster—the O'Donnell and O'Neill.

Utterly defeated, Shane, as a last refuge, fled to the settlement of the Scotch islanders, whom so shortly before he had assailed, in the hope of finding among them a fresh alliance, or at least a temporary refuge; his fate is thus detailed in a contemporary English account included in the act of attainder subsequently passed upon him: "The 2nd of June, 1567, feeling himself all weakened, and beholding his declination and fall near at hand, [he] avowed and fully determined to come in disguised manner, for fear of intercepting, with a collar about his neck, to the presence of the lord deputy, and to submit himself as a most wretched man, hoping by that order of humility to have found some mercy and grace at your majesty's hands, but he was stayed against his will by such as pretended to be his trustiest friends, and in especial the persuasion of a barbarous clerk, named Neyll MacKever, whom he had in most reputation and used for his secretary, by whose counsel the said rebel was drawn first to try and treat the friendship of the Scots in joining with them for the maintaining of that his traitorous rebellion, which if he might not obtain, then agreed that his first determination was the likeliest way to save his life with the loss of his land and reputation, and thereupon took his journey towards the Scots, who were encamped in Clandeboy to the number of six hundred, under the leading of Alexander Oge, brother to James MacConell and one MacGilly Asspuke, his nephew, son to Agnes Jyle, brother also to the said James, which was slain in the late overthrow given by the said Shane

[1567 A.D.]

O'Neill to the Scots, and so entered the tent of the said Alexander, accompanied with O'Donnell's wife, whom he kept, Swarley Boy, brother to the said Alexander, the said secretary, and the number of fifty horsemen, where after a few dissembled gratulatory words used betwixt them, they fell to quaffing and drinking of wine. This Agnes Jyle's son, all inflamed with malice and desire of revenge for the death of his father and uncle, began to administer quarrelling talk to O'Neill, who took the same very hot, and after some reproachful words passed betwixt them, the said Gillaspuke demanded of the secretary whether he had bruited abroad that the lady, his aunt, wife unto James MacConell, did offer to come out of Scotland into Ireland to marry with O'Neill. The secretary affirmed himself to be the author of that report, and said withal, that if his aunt were queen of Scotland, she might well be contented to match herself with O'Neill; the other with that gave him the lie, and said that the lady, his aunt, was a woman of that honesty and reputation as would not take him, that was the betrayer and murderer of her worthy husband. O'Neill, giving ear to the talk, began to maintain his secretary's quarrel, and thereupon Gillaspuke withdrew himself out of the tent and came abroad amongst his men, who forthwith raised a fray, and fell to the killing of O'Neill's men; and the Scots, as people thirsty of O'Neill's blood, for requiting the slaughter of their master and kinsfolk, assembled together in a throng and thrust into the tent where the said O'Neill was, and there with their slaughter swords hewed him to pieces, slew his secretary and all those that were with him, except a very few which escaped by their horses. Alexander Oge, after this bouchery handling of this cruel tyrant, caused his mangled carcass to be carried into an old ruinous church near unto the camp, where, for lack of a better shroud, he was wrapped in a kerne's old shirt, and there miserably interred—a fit end for such a beginning, and a funeral pomp convenient for so great a defacer of God's temples and a withstander of his prince's laws and regal authority. And after being four days in earth was taken up by William Piers; and his head, sundered from his body, was brought unto the said lord deputy to Drogheda, the 21st day of June, 1567, and from thence carried into the city of Dublin, where it was bodied with a stake and standeth on the top of your majesty's castle of Dublin."f

Shane the Proud, as his countrymen called him, was perhaps the ablest of Elizabeth's Irish opponents. Alone he bore the brunt of the contest, and he must have cost the English crown a sum altogether out of proportion to his own resources. Shane was cruel and tyrannical, and his moral character was as bad as possible. He had an oriental want of scruple about murdering inconvenient people, and he had no regard for truth. By far the most remarkable Irishman of his time, he cannot be regarded in any sense as a national hero. His ambition was limited to making himself supreme in Ulster.^h

THE GERALDINE REBELLION

Peace was soon broken by disturbances in the south. The earl of Desmondⁱ having shown rebellious tendencies was detained for six years in London. Treated leniently, but grievously pressed for money, he tried to escape, and,

[ⁱ The Anglo-Norman Desmonds had lived long enough in Ireland to imbibe the unfailing humour of the race. It is related that during this period of struggle between the Butlers and the Desmonds the Butlers in a night attack surprised and defeated the earl of Desmond's force. The earl himself was severely wounded and taken prisoner. Borne from the field on a litter carried on the shoulders of four of the Butlers, he was taunted by them on his defeat. "Where is now the great earl of Desmond?" asked one. "Where it is fitting he should be—on the necks of the Butlers," came the instant reply.]

[1567-1575 A.D.]

the attempt being judged treasonable, he was persuaded to surrender his estates—to receive them back or not at the queen's discretion. Seizing the opportunity, English adventurers proposed to plant a military colony from the Shannon to Cork harbour. Some who held obsolete title-deeds were encouraged to go to work at once by the example of Sir Peter Carew, who had established his claims in Carlow. Carew's title had been in abeyance for a century and a half, yet most of the Kavanaghs attorned to him. Falling foul of Ormonde's brothers, seizing their property and using great cruelty and violence, Sir Peter drove the Butlers, the only one among the great families really loyal, into rebellion. Ormonde, who was in London, could alone restore peace; all his disputes with Desmond were at once settled in his favour, and he was even allowed to resume the exaction of coyne and livery, the abolition of which had been the darling wish of statesmen. The Butlers returned to their allegiance, but continued to oppose Carew, and great atrocities were committed on both sides. Sir Peter had great but undefined claims in Munster also, and the people there took warning. His imitators in Cork were swept away. Sidney first, and after him Humphrey Gilbert, could only circumscribe the rebellion. The presidency of Munster, an office the creation of which had long been contemplated, was then conferred on Sir John Perrott, who drove Fitzmaurice into the mountains, reduced castles everywhere, and destroyed a Scottish contingent which had come from Ulster to help the rebels. Fitzmaurice came in and knelt in the mud at the president's feet, confessing his sins; but he remained the real victor. The colonising scheme was dropped, and the first presidency of Munster left the Desmonds and their allies in possession.^b

After the attainder of Shane O'Neill more than half of Ulster was confiscated; and the attempt to clear off the old natives and plant new settlers was commenced without delay. In 1570 the peninsula of Ardes in Down was granted to the queen's secretary, Sir Thomas Smith, who sent his illegitimate son with a colony to take possession. But this plantation was a failure, for the owners, the O'Neills of Clandeboye, not feeling inclined to part with their rights without a struggle, attacked and killed the young undertaker in 1573.

The next undertaker was a more important man, Walter Devereux, earl of Essex.^d In 1573 he undertook to subdue and colonise with one thousand two hundred men the district of Clanhuby, in the province of Ulster. By a contract between him and Elizabeth, it was agreed that each should furnish an equal share of the expense; and that the colony should be equally divided between them, as soon as it had been planted with two thousand settlers. Essex was dazzled with the splendid prospect before him; and his enemies at court stimulated him with predictions of success, though they had no other view than to remove him from the presence of the queen. When he had mortgaged his estates, and proceeded in the enterprise till it would be ruinous to retrace his steps, they began to throw impediments in his way. The summer was almost past before he could reach Ireland. There, Fitzwilliams, the lord deputy, objected to his powers; the natives, under Phelim O'Neill, opposed a formidable resistance; and it was discovered that the provisions furnished by the queen were unsound and her troops ill provided with arms. He maintained himself with difficulty during the winter.

In the spring the enterprise was abandoned, and the earl consented to aid the deputy in suppressing the insurgents in different parts of the island. It would be tedious to follow this adventurous nobleman through his remaining career. He proposed plans which were approved and then rejected; he obtained leave to return home, and was sent back to Ireland with the empty title

[1576-1580 A.D.]

of earl marshal; and at length (1576), after a succession of disappointments, he died at Dublin of a dysentery, probably caused by anxiety of mind, though by report his death was attributed to poison, supposed to have been administered to him by the procurement of Leicester.

This new plan of colonisation was viewed with horror by the natives both of Irish and of English extraction. In the expulsion of the adherents of O'Neill they saw, or thought they saw, the fate which was reserved for themselves; and many chieftains, either in person or by messengers, implored the aid of the Catholic powers for the preservation of their property and of their religion. The kings of France and Spain were occupied with concerns of more immediate interest; but Gregory XIII, who had succeeded to the chair of St. Peter, lent a willing ear to their complaints and solicitations. In the bull of his predecessor, Ireland had not been named; but the omission was now supplied; and Gregory signed, though he did not publish, a new bull, by which Elizabeth was declared to have forfeited the crown of Ireland no less than that of England.

Among those who offered to carry it into execution were Thomas Stukely and James Fitzmaurice. Stukely was an English adventurer, without honour or conscience, who had sold his services at the same time to the queen and to the pope, and who alternately abused the confidence and betrayed the secrets of each. Having obtained from the pontiff a ship of war, six hundred disciplined soldiers, and three thousand stand of arms, he sailed from Civita Vecchia to join Fitzmaurice at Lisbon; but immediately offered his services to Sebastian, king of Portugal, and perished in the company of that prince at the battle of Alcazar, against Abd-al-Malik, king of Fez and Morocco. Fitzmaurice was an Irishman, the brother of the earl of Desmond, and an inveterate enemy to the English government. He suffered shipwreck on the coast of Galicia; but with the aid of the papal ambassador procured other vessels, and, sailing from Portugal, took possession of the port of Smerwick, near Kerry. He had brought with him no more than eighty Spanish soldiers, a few Irish and English exiles, and the celebrated Doctor Saunders, in the capacity of papal legate. But he trusted to the popularity of his name, the resources of his family, and the influence of a bull which granted to his followers all the privileges usually enjoyed by the crusaders.

Fitzmaurice's hopes were however disappointed [although he was joined by two of Desmond's brothers]; the Irish, taught by preceding failures, listened with coldness to his solicitations; he fell in a private quarrel with one of his kinsmen; and the invaders, to save themselves from destruction, sought an asylum among the retainers of the earl of Desmond. Though that nobleman made loud professions of loyalty, his conduct provoked suspicion; he was proclaimed a traitor and his dominions were plundered by the English. At the moment when his fortunes appeared desperate, a ray of hope appeared (1580). Lord Grey de Wilton, the new deputy, was defeated in the vale of Glendalough; and San Giuseppe, an Italian officer in the pay of the pontiff, arrived at Smerwick from Portugal, with several hundred men, a large sum of money, and five thousand stand of arms. But the newcomers had scarcely erected a fort [on the site of the old fort of Dunanore], when they were besieged by the lord deputy on land, and blockaded on the sea side by Admiral Winter. San Giuseppe, in opposition to the advice of the officers, proposed to surrender; the soldiers joined in the opinion of their commander, and an offer was made to deliver the place to the besiegers. By the English it has been asserted that no conditions were granted; by the foreigners, that they had capitulated for their lives. Sir Walter Raleigh entered the fort, received their arms, and then ordered or permitted them to be massacred in cold blood.

[1580-1585 A.D.]

The poet Spenser, secretary to Lord Grey, attempts to vindicate the conduct of the deputy, and says "that the enemy begged they might be allowed to depart with their lives and arms, according to the law of nations. He asked to see their commission from the pope or the king of Spain. They had none, they were the allies of the Irish. But the Irish, replied Grey, are traitors, and you must suffer as traitors. I will make no terms with you; you may submit or not. They yielded, craving 'only mercy;' which it being not thought good to show them, for danger of them, if, being saved, they should afterwards join with the Irish; and also for terror to the Irish, who are much emboldened by those foreign succours, and also put in hope of more ere long; there was no other way but to make that short end of them as was made." Sir Richard Bingham, an eye-witness, says, "that they surrendered overnight to the lord-deputy's will, to have mercy or not," and the next morning the mariners and soldiers entered the place, and fell to "ryfling, and spoyling, and withall kylling, which they never ceased whilst there lyved one." He estimates the slain at betwixt four and five hundred, or five and six hundred.

This disastrous event extinguished the last hope of Desmond; yet he contrived to elude the diligence of his pursuers, and for three years dragged on a miserable existence among the glens and forests. At last (1583) a small party of his enemies, attracted by a glimmering light, entered a hut, in which they found the venerable old man, without attendants, lying on the hearth before the fire. He had only time to exclaim "I am the earl of Desmond," when Kelly of Moriarty struck off his head, which was conveyed, a grateful present, to Elizabeth, and by her order fixed on London bridge.^c

So ended the great Geraldine rebellion. The horrors of the war are impossible to exaggerate. Munster was a desert. *The Four Masters*^a tell us that "the lowing of a cow or the voice of a ploughman could scarcely be heard from Dunqueen in the west of Kerry to Cashel." How many were slain it is impossible to know, but we have Ormonde's word that his troops killed five thousand in a few months. The poet Edmund Spenser, an eye-witness, says that famine slew more than the sword.

"Ere one year and a half," he tells us in his *View of the State of Ireland*,^j "they [the natives] were brought to such wretchedness as that any stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them; they looked like anatomies of death; they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eat the dead carrions, happy where they could find them; yea, and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and if they found a plot of water-cresses or sham-rocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time; yet not able long to continue therewithal, that in short space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man and beast; yet sure, in all that war, there perished not many by the sword, but all by the extremity of famine, which they themselves had wrought."^a

In 1584 Sir John Perrott, the ablest man available after Sidney's retirement, became lord-deputy. Sir John Norris, famed in the Netherland wars, was president of Munster, and so impressed the Irish that they averred him to be in league with the devil. Perrott held a parliament in 1585 in which the number of members was considerably increased. He made a strenuous effort to found a university in Dublin, and proposed to endow it with the revenues of St. Patrick's, reasonably arguing that one cathedral was enough for any city. Here he was opposed by Loftus, archbishop of Dublin and chancellor, who had expressed his anxiety for a college, but had no idea of

endowing it at his own expense. The colonisation of the Munster forfeitures was undertaken at this time. It failed chiefly from the grants to individuals who neglected to plant English farmers, and were often absentees themselves. Raleigh obtained forty-two thousand acres. The quit rents reserved to the crown were less than one penny per acre. Racked with the stone, hated by the official clique, thwarted on all sides, poor Perrott was goaded into using words capable of a treasonable interpretation. Archbishop Loftus pursued him to the end. He died in the Tower under sentence for treason, and we may charitably hope that Elizabeth would have pardoned him. In his will, written after sentence, he emphatically repudiates any treasonable intention—"I deny my Lord God if ever I proposed the same."

HUGH O'NEILL, EARL OF TYRONE

The exasperation of the northern chiefs against the government may be measured by the fact that at length they became willing to forego their traditional feuds and combine against the common enemy. All now that was wanted for an almost national uprising was a leader of ability, and such was found in Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone.

Hugh O'Neill was the second son of Matthew, the first baron of Dungannon, the reputed son of Con O'Neill, the first earl of Tyrone. If the statements as to paternity of Matthew be correct neither he nor his sons were O'Neills at all, and their only connection with the family was the intrigue of Con O'Neill with the mother of Matthew, and the limitation of the earldom of Tyrone to him in remainder after the death of Con. The baron of Dungannon and his sons became the English claimants for the principality of Ulster, and upon every quarrel with the elected chief were put forward by the government as the rightful lords of Tyrone by virtue of the surrender and regrant of these lands to Con O'Neill by Henry VIII. But whenever it seemed more politic to come to terms with the O'Neill *de facto* (and *de jure*, according to Celtic ideas) the claims of this family were disregarded, and the bastardy of the first baron officially admitted.

The first baron was slain by Shane O'Neill in 1558, and his eldest son by Turlough during Shane's visit to London. Hugh, the third Baron Dungannon, was then young, and his claims were disregarded for many years. In the mean time he was educated among the English; brought over to court by Sidney, given a troop of horse in the queen's service, and to all outward appearance had become an Englishman. He served in the English army in the Irish wars, co-operated with Essex in the settlement of Antrim and the Ulster war, and was commended for his zeal and loyalty in the queen's service. In 1584 he was put in possession of the southeastern portion of Tyrone. In 1587 the queen granted to him by patent the earldom of Tyrone without any reservation.¹

But the favour of the queen's government was soon to be withdrawn. Many things conspired to bring about a rupture. Turlough O'Neill, the leader of a rival sept of the family, made peace with the English, who therefore no longer needed Tyrone's influence to offset his. Another factor was the hostility of the lord marshal, Sir Henry Bagenal, with whose sister the earl had eloped, incurring thereby his everlasting enmity. The English suspected or pretended to suspect O'Neill of treasonable designs. His orders of lead for roofing the buildings on his estate were suspiciously large. His efforts to win the friendship of the most powerful of the disaffected chiefs, as the O'Donnells, to one of whom, Hugh O'Donnell, he gave his daughter in mar-

[1593-1595 A.D.]

riage, were considered as evidence of his guilty intent. He was summoned before the council at Dublin, where his replies to all questions were so satisfactory as almost to allay suspicion. He indignantly repudiated any intention of disloyalty, and a series of charges prepared by Bagenal were tabled for the time being. But the English attitude towards Tyrone was no longer that of a friend, and he realised it.^a

It was now inevitable that the earl of Tyrone, the lion cub whom the English had reared, should go into rebellion. The question here arises, was he, while professing the utmost loyalty to the queen, a crafty traitor all through, as English writers surmise? An attentive study of his life leads to the opposite conclusion. He succeeded in his object, that of regaining possession of Tyrone, and had to accept the consequences of his success. His character confirms this view of his career; in his course of conduct he was essentially not a Celt; he possessed none of the enthusiasm or instability of his nation; he did not exhibit the reckless audacity, self-confidence, vanity, and uncivilised craft of Shane; his composed and polite manners were in contradistinction to the violent and excited expressions of his chiefs. He never committed himself by any hasty or ill-considered step, yet he was able, when the occasion required it, to put his whole fortune at hazard. He was led astray by neither patriotism nor enthusiasm, as his conduct proved repeatedly; he perfectly knew the measure of his power, and, patient, cool, and conciliatory, was admirably adapted to play a losing game; and, when he had lost his stake, he exhibited the very un-Irish quality of appreciating existing facts, and having failed in his attempt to make himself not merely The O'Neill, but the ruler of Ireland, acquiesced in his position, and was willing to make the best of circumstances by sinking back into the position of an English nobleman. He was not a great (but almost a great) man; a most able adventurer, whose reputation has been dwarfed by the small theatre in which he played his part; yet, after every allowance, he was undoubtedly the ablest man whom the Celtic race since the arrival of the English had produced.

THE REVOLT OF O'NEILL

The conduct of Hugh O'Neill towards the other Irish chiefs was very different from that adopted by Shane; he did not attempt to enforce the feudal pretensions of his family, or endeavour to reduce the power of the rival house of O'Donnell; on the contrary, he made himself the head of a confederacy of those who had suffered wrongs at the hands of the English government; he had bound to himself Hugh O'Donnell by a personal friendship, and, although not holding any ostensible office, contrived to exercise a complete command over the Ulster lords and a directing influence over the chiefs who, by his assistance, rose in rebellion in the other provinces. In November, 1594, the entire force which the Ulster chiefs could put in the field was estimated at 15,130 foot and 2,238 horse; but the vast proportion of these were irregular troops, and no large force could be kept together for any length of time.

The entire English regular force in Ireland in 1595, as appears by the muster master's return of that year, was 657 horse and 4,040 foot, which must be reduced by the deficiencies in the companies occasioned by the captains systematically omitting to report losses, and drawing pay for the nominal strength under their command. The levies of the Pale make no figure in the war.

On the 28th of June, 1595, a proclamation was issued against O'Neill and the confederates, in which the earl was reproached with the bastardy of his father, whose legitimacy the English government had maintained during the

lifetime of Shane O'Neill. On the 18th of June, the deputy and Sir J. Norris invaded Ulster in force, upon whose advance the earl determined neither to be drawn into an action nor to waste his forces in defending unnecessary forts; he destroyed his castle of Dungannon, and confined himself to continual skirmishing with the enemy. The army returned to Dundalk without having effected anything. [The prosecution of the war in Munster was placed absolutely in Norris' hands, and Sir Richard Bingham was put in command in Connaught, where his extreme severity soon drove all the chiefs in the province into open rebellion.]

The queen, being disgusted with the course the war was taking, was now anxious to open negotiations, and O'Neill was anxious to arrange matters on reasonable terms, or if that could not be done, to waste as much time as possible. The object of the government was to induce the various chiefs to negotiate separately, and thus, if possible, to break up the confederacy; but, on the other hand, O'Neill was resolved that the confederates should be represented by himself alone, and all should be included in the one arrangement. Practically the earl carried his point, for all the demands were evidently drawn up by preconcerted arrangement.

As the queen suspected, O'Neill was in communication with Spain. On the 17th of September, 1595, he had written that their only hope of re-establishing the Catholic religion lay with him; now or never the church should be succoured. He declared that with the aid of three thousand soldiers the faith might be established within one year in Ireland, the heretics would disappear, and no other sovereign would be recognised save the king Catholic.

Both the queen and O'Neill overrated the power of Spain to interfere in Ireland. The former greatness of Spain, the possession of the Indies, its fabulous wealth, and ardent Catholicity, still blinded men as to its loss of all real power and energy. They did not yet understand that this great empire was in a state of insolvency; and that even if able to lend assistance to the insurgents, it had the Low Countries and the French war on its hands, and had never postponed secular advantages to the interest of the faith.

An armistice having been arranged on the 13th of January, 1596, two commissioners on the part of the government left Dublin to confer with O'Neill. As the negotiations proceeded, O'Neill and O'Donnell assumed the position of protectors of all insurgents against the queen. The English government, perplexed and exasperated, discovered that Irish affairs were entering into a new phase, and a national league was being formed which would require the utmost strength of England to subdue.^f

In January, 1597, Bingham was removed from the Connaught command, and Sir Conyers Clifford, an able and humane man, set in his place. Lord Thomas Borough, appointed lord-deputy in 1597, planned an attack on the confederated chiefs in three divisions. The first division, led by Lord Borough himself, succeeded in capturing and garrisoning Portmore, but sustained a defeat at Drumflugh on the Blackwater at O'Neill's hands, the lord-deputy receiving wounds from which he died soon after. The second division, under Clifford, was defeated and turned back by O'Donnell; the last, under Lord Barnewell, was almost annihilated by Tyrrell, and its commander captured.

THE BATTLE OF YELLOW FORD

O'Neill next proceeded to lay siege to the garrison which Lord Borough had left under Captain Williams at Portmore. The food and ammunition of the besieged ran short and their situation was critical.^g

[1598 A.D.]

When tidings of these events reached Dublin, the council sat in long and anxious deliberation; but at last Marshal Bagenal persuaded them to entrust him with the perilous task of relieving the fort. The Marshal arrived at Armagh (August, 1598) with an army of four thousand foot and three hundred and fifty horse. The five miles highway between the city and Portmore was a narrow strip of uneven ground, with bogs and woods at both sides; and right in the way, at Bellanaboy, or the Yellow Ford, on the little river Callan, two miles north of Armagh, O'Neill had marshalled his forces and determined to dispute the passage. His army was perhaps a little more numerous than that of his adversary, well trained and disciplined, armed and equipped after the English fashion—though not so well as Bagenal's army—and he had the advantage of an excellent position selected by himself. He had with him Hugh Roe O'Donnell, Maguire, and MacDonnell of the Glens, all leaders of ability and experience. At intervals along the way he had dug deep holes and trenches, and had otherwise encumbered the line of march with felled trees and brushwood; and right in front of his main body extended a trench a mile long, five feet deep, and four feet across, with a thick hedge of thorns on top. Over these tremendous obstacles, in face of the whole strength of the Irish army, Bagenal must force his way if he was ever to reach the starving little band cooped up in Portmore.

But Bagenal was not a man easily daunted; and on the morning of the 14th of August, 1598, he began his march with music and drum. The army advanced in six regiments forming three divisions. The first division—two regiments—was commanded by Colonel Percy, the marshal himself, as commander-in-chief, riding in the second regiment. The second division, consisting of the third and fourth regiments, was commanded by Colonel Cosby and Sir Thomas Wingfield, and the third division by Captains Coneys and Billings. The horse formed two divisions, one on each wing, under Sir Calisthenes Brooke, with Captains Montague and Fleming. The regiments marched one behind another at intervals of six hundred or seven hundred paces.

On the night before, O'Neill had sent forward five hundred light-armed kern, who concealed themselves till morning in the woods and thickets along the way, and the English had not advanced far when these opened fire from both sides, which they kept up during the whole march past. Through all obstacles—fire, bog, and pitfalls—the army struggled and fought resolutely till the first regiment reached the great trench. A determined rush across, a brief and fierce hand-to-hand struggle, and in spite of all opposition they got to the other side. Instantly re-forming, they pushed on, but had got only a little way when they were charged by a solid body of Irish and utterly overwhelmed.

It now appeared that a fatal mistake in tactics had been made by Bagenal. The several regiments were too far asunder, and the men of the vanguard were almost all killed before the second regiment could come up. When at last this second line appeared, O'Neill with a body of horse, knowing that Bagenal was at their head, spurred forward to seek him out and settle wrong and quarrel hand to hand. But they were not fated to meet. The brave marshal, fatigued with fighting, lifted his visor for a moment to look about him and take breath; but hardly had he done so when a musket ball pierced his brain and he fell lifeless.

Even after this catastrophe the second regiment passed the trench, and were augmented by those of the first who survived. These soon found themselves hard pressed; which Cosby, becoming aware of, pushed on with his third regiment to their relief; but they were cut to pieces before he had come

[1598 A.D.]

up. A cannon had got bogged in Cosby's rear, straight in the line of march, and the oxen that drew it having been killed, the men of the fourth regiment made frantic efforts to free it, fighting for their lives all the time, for the Irish were swarming all around them. Meantime during this delay Cosby's regiment was attacked and destroyed, and he himself was taken prisoner.

While all this was taking place in the English front, there was hard fighting in the rear. For O'Neill, who with a small party of horse had kept his place near the trench, fighting and issuing orders, had at the beginning of the battle sent towards the enemy's rear O'Donnell, Maguire, and MacDonnell of the Glens, who, passing by the flank of the second division, hotly engaged as they were, fell on the last two regiments, which after a prolonged struggle to get forward, "being hard sett to, retyred foully [in disorder] to Armagh."

The fourth regiment, at last leaving their cannon, made a dash for the trench; but scarcely had they started when a wagon of gunpowder exploded in their midst, by which they were "disrancked and rowted" and great numbers were killed, "wherewith the traitors were encouraged and our men dismayed." O'Neill, observing the confusion, seized the moment for a furious charge. The main body of the English had been already wavering after the explosion, and now there was a general rout of both middle and rear. Fighting on the side of the English was an Irish chief, Mailmora or Myles O'Reilly, who was known as Mailmora the Handsome, and who called himself the queen's O'Reilly. He made two or three desperate attempts to rally the flying squadrons, but all in vain; and at last he himself fell slain among the others.

The multitude fled back towards Armagh, protected by the cavalry under Captain Montague, an able and intrepid officer, for Sir Calisthenes Brooke had been wounded; and the Irish pursued them—as the old Irish chronicler expresses it—"by pairs, threes, scores, and thirties." Two thousand of the English were killed, together with their general and nearly all the officers; and the victors became masters of the artillery, ammunition, and stores of the royal army. On the Irish side the loss is variously estimated from two hundred to seven hundred. This was the greatest overthrow the English ever suffered since they had set foot in Ireland.

The fugitives to the number of one thousand five hundred shut themselves up in Armagh, where they were closely invested by the Irish. But Montague, with a body of horse, most courageously forced his way out and brought the evil tidings to Dublin. In a few days the garrisons of Armagh and Portmore capitulated—the valiant Captain Williams yielding only after a most pressing message from Armagh—and were permitted to retire to Dundalk, leaving colours, drums, and ammunition behind.

When the southern chiefs heard of O'Neill's great victory, the Munster rebellion broke out like lightning. The confederates attacked the settlements to regain the lands that had been taken from them a dozen years before; they expelled the settlers; and before long they had recovered all Desmond's castles. The lord-lieutenant and sir Thomas Norris, president of Munster, were quite unable to cope with the rebellion, and left Munster to the rebels.^d

In seventeen days, *The Four Masters*^a tell us, there was not a single Saxon left alive in all the Desmond domains. Edmund Spenser lost his all and fled to England, there to die poor and neglected in a London garret. Hugh O'Neill was almost a king in Ireland. He received a crown of peacock's feathers from the pope. He granted, as any English king might, the lands and title of earl of Desmond to James Fitzgerald, known in history as the *Sugan* or

[1599-1603 A. D.]

straw-rope earl. Elizabeth sent over the young earl of Essex, son of the Essex of the Plantations, with a fine army of twenty thousand men. But he could not cope with O'Neill, who outwitted and outgeneralled him, and finally after a truce the earl threw up his command and sailed suddenly to England, there to enter upon the mad career that ended on the scaffold. In the same year Sir Conyers Clifford marching into Sligo was defeated and slain by Hugh O'Donnell at Ballaghboy. "The Irish of Connaught," say *The Four Masters*, "were not pleased at Clifford's death, for he had never told them a falsehood."

In the following year Lord Mountjoy (Charles Blount), a man of great ability and foresight, succeeded as lord-lieutenant. He was accompanied by



KILCOLMAN CASTLE
Residence of Edmund Spenser

Sir George Carew, a trained soldier, who became president of Munster. At once the war took on a new aspect. Carew laid waste Munster, and was unceasing in his efforts to capture "the Sungan earl." This fiery leader was at length betrayed into Carew's hands, tried and condemned, but not executed, lest his brother should be set up in his place and continue to give trouble. In the mean time Mountjoy himself kept O'Neill and O'Donnell busy in the north. Leinster, which had of late years escaped the ravages of war, was devastated by the lord-lieutenant, and Sir Henry Docwra built a strong fort at Derry. By the middle of 1601 the rebellion was entirely crushed in the three southern provinces, while in the north O'Neill and O'Donnell had been gradually shut in. In September, 1601, a Spanish force under Don Juan del Aguila landed at Kinsale, where it was at once beset by the combined forces of Mountjoy and Carew. The Spanish were reinforced by O'Donnell, who skilfully eluded Carew, and the English hemmed in on two sides became themselves the besieged. The Irish and Spaniards were further reinforced by Tyrone in December, by which time the English had lost half their army through sickness and battle. On January 3d, 1602, a night attack, planned by O'Neill, was repulsed, and finally turned by Mountjoy's brilliant generalship into an English victory. The Irish were completely routed, and Del Aguila soon after surrendered. The tide had at length turned against O'Neill.

O'Donnell was despatched to Spain for reinforcements, but died there without accomplishing anything. The news of his death disheartened the Irish. Carew reduced Dunboy Castle.*

Tyrone submitted at last, craving pardon on his knees, renouncing his Celtic chieftaincy and abjuring all foreign powers, but still retaining his earldom,

and power almost too great for a subject. Scarcely was the ink dry when he was told of the great queen's death. He burst into tears, not of grief, but of vexation at not having held out for still better terms.

RESULTS OF THE ELIZABETHAN CONQUEST: RELIGIOUS POLICY

In reviewing the Irish government of Elizabeth we shall find much to blame, a want of truth in her dealings and of steadiness in her policy. Violent efforts of coercion were succeeded by fits of clemency, of parsimony, or of apathy. Yet it is fair to remember that she was surrounded by enemies, that her best energies were expended in the death struggle with Spain, and that she was rarely able to give undivided attention to the Irish problem. After all, she conquered Ireland, which her predecessors had failed to do, though many of them were as crooked in action and less upright in intention. Considering the times, Elizabeth cannot be called a persecutor. "Do not," she said to the elder Essex, "seek too hastily to bring people that have been trained in another religion from that in which they have been brought up."

Elizabeth saw that the Irish could only be reached through their own language. But for that harvest the labourers were necessarily few. The fate of Bishop Daly of Kildare, who preached in Irish, and who thrice had his house burned over his head, was not likely to encourage missionaries. To preach what he thought true when he could do it safely, to testify against toleration, and in the mean time to make a fortune, was too often the sum and substance of an Anglican prelate's work in Ireland. In all wild parts divine service was neglected, and wandering friars or subtle Jesuits, supported by every patriotic or religious feeling of the people, kept Ireland faithful to Rome. Against her many shortcomings we must set the queen's foundation of that university which has been the one successful English institution in Ireland.

IRELAND UNDER JAMES I: THE PLANTATION OF ULSTER

Great things were expected of James I. He was Mary Stuart's son, and there was a curious antiquarian notion afloat that, because the Irish were the original "Scoti," a Scottish king would sympathise with Ireland. Corporate towns set up the mass, and Mountjoy, who could argue as well as fight, had to teach them a sharp lesson. Finding Ireland conquered and in no condition to rise again, James established circuits and a complete system of shires. Sir John Davies was sent over as solicitor-general. The famous book (*A Discourse why Ireland has never been Entirely Subdued*,² 1612), in which he glorifies his own and the king's exploits, gives far too much credit to the latter and far too little to his great predecessor.

Two legal decisions swept away the customs of tanistry and of Irish gavelkind, and the English land system was violently substituted. Tyrone was harassed by sheriffs and other officers, and the government, learning that he was engaged in an insurrectionary design, prepared to seize him. The information was probably false, but Tyrone was growing old and nervous, and perhaps despaired of making good his defence. By leaving Ireland he played into his enemies' hands. Rory O'Donnell, created earl of Tyrconnel, accompanied him. [They fled to Rome, where Tyrone became a pensioner of the pope and of Spain and died in 1616.] Cuconnaught Maguire had already gone. The "flight of the earls," as it is called, completed the ruin of the Celtic cause. Reasons or pretexts for declaring forfeitures against O'Cahan and O'Reilly were easily found. O'Dogherty, chief of Innishowen, and fore-

[1608-1611 A.D.]

man of the grand jury which found a bill for treason against the earls, received a blow from Paulet, the governor of Derry. O'Dogherty rose, Derry was sacked, and Paulet murdered. O'Dogherty having been killed and O'Hanlon and others being implicated, the whole of northern Ulster was at the disposal of the government. Tyrone, Donegal, Armagh, Cavan, Fermanagh, and Derry were parcelled out among English and Scotch colonists, portions being reserved to the natives. The site of Derry was granted to the citizens of London, who fortified and armed it, and Londonderry became the chief bulwark of the colonists in two great wars.

If we look at its morality we shall find little to praise, but in a political point of view the plantation of Ulster was successful. The northern province, which so severely taxed the energies of Elizabeth, has since been the most prosperous and loyal part of Ireland. But the conquered people remained side by side with the settlers; and Sir George Carew, who reported on the plantation in 1611, clearly foresaw that they would rebel again "under the veil of religion and liberty, than which nothing is esteemed so precious in the hearts of men." Those natives who retained land were often oppressed by their stronger neighbours, and sometimes actually swindled out of their property.

The Irish Parliament

It may be convenient to notice here the parliamentary history of the English colony in Ireland, which corresponds pretty closely to that of the mother country. First there are informal meetings of eminent persons; then, in 1295, there is a parliament of which some acts remain, and to which only knights of the shire were summoned to represent the commons. Burgesses were added as early as 1310. The famous parliament of Kilkenny in 1367 was largely attended, but the details of its composition are not known. The most ancient Irish parliament remaining on record was held in 1374, twenty members in all being summoned to the house of commons, from the counties of Dublin, Louth, Kildare, and Carlow, the liberties and crosses of Meath, the city of Dublin, and the towns of Drogheda and Dundalk. The liberties were those districts in which the great vassals of the crown exercised palatinate jurisdiction, and the crosses were the church lands, where alone the royal writ usually ran.

Writs for another parliament in the same year were addressed in addition to the counties of Waterford, Cork, and Limerick; the liberties and crosses of Ulster, Wexford, Tipperary, and Kerry; the cities of Waterford, Cork, and Limerick; and the towns of Youghal, Kinsale, Ross, Wexford, and Kilkenny. The counties of Clare and Longford, and the towns of Galway and



YOUGHAL ABBEY

Athenry were afterwards added, and the number of popular representatives does not appear to have much exceeded sixty during the later Middle Ages. In the house of lords the temporal peers were largely outnumbered by the bishops and mitred abbots. Elizabeth's first parliament, held in 1559, was attended by 76 members of the lower house, which increased to 122 in 1585. In 1613 James I, by a wholesale creation of new boroughs, generally of the last insignificance, increased the house of commons to 232, and thus secured an Anglican majority to carry out his policy. He told those who remonstrated to mind their own business. "What is it to you if I had created 40 noblemen and 400 boroughs? The more the merrier, the fewer the better cheer." In 1639 the house of commons had 274 members, a number which was further increased to 300 at the Revolution, and so it remained until the union.

Religious Policy of James I

Steeped in absolutist ideas, James was not likely to tolerate religious dissent. A proclamation for banishing Romish priests issued in 1605, and was followed by an active and general persecution, which was so far from succeeding that they continued to flock in from abroad. The most severe English statutes against the Catholic laity had never been re-enacted in Ireland, and, in the absence of law, illegal means were taken to enforce uniformity. On the whole, Protestantism made little progress, though the number of Protestant settlers increased. As late as 1622, when Lord Falkland was installed as deputy, the illustrious Ussher, then bishop of Meath, preached from the text, "he beareth not his sword in vain," and descanted on the over-indulgence shown to recusants. Primate Hampton, in a letter which is a model of Christian eloquence, mildly rebuked his eminent suffragan.

CHARLES I AND STRAFFORD

The necessities of Charles I induced his ministers to propose that a great part of Connaught should be declared forfeited owing to mere technical flaws in title, and planted like Ulster. Such was the general outcry that the scheme had to be given up; and, on receiving a large grant from the Irish parliament, the king promised certain graces, of which the chief were security for titles, a free trade, and the substitution of an oath of allegiance for that of supremacy. Having got the money, Charles as usual broke his word; and in 1635 Lord-deputy Strafford began a general system of extortion. The Connaught and Munster landowners were shamelessly forced to pay large fines for the confirmation of even recent titles.

The Irish woollen manufacture was discouraged as hurtful to England; and, if linen was encouraged, it was only because no linen was made in the greater kingdom. The money obtained by oppressing the Irish nation was employed to create an army for the oppression of the Scotch and English nations. The Roman Catholics were neither awed nor conciliated. Twelve bishops, headed by Primate Usher, solemnly protested that "to tolerate popery is a grievous sin." The Ulster Presbyterians were rigorously treated. Of the prelates employed by Strafford in this insane persecution the ablest was Bramhall of Derry, who not only oppressed the ministers but insulted them by coarse language. The "black oath," which bound those who took it never to oppose Charles in anything, was enforced on all ministers, and those who refused it were driven from their manses and often stripped of

[1635-1642 A.D.]

their goods. Strafford was recalled to expiate his career on the scaffold; the army was disbanded, and the helm of the state remained in the hands of a land jobber and of a superannuated soldier.^b

THE INSURRECTION OF 1641

The Irish insurrection of 1641 was one of the most terrible events in the history of that unhappy country. It was an event which long perpetuated the hatred between the Irish natives and the English settlers, and in a series of bitter revenges kept alive the more deadly animosity between Catholics and Protestants. The Irish army, which had been raised by Strafford, had been kept together against the desire of the parliament. King Charles had wished to establish that army in Flanders, to be ready for any service under the king of Spain; but his plan had been prevented by a parliamentary resolution, which afterwards became a law, against "the raising and transporting of forces of horse or foot out of his majesty's dominions of England or Ireland." This Catholic army was therefore disbanded, and it became a dangerous power in a distracted country. The vigilant rule of Strafford was at an end. There was no resident viceroy. The government was administered by the two lords justices. The Protestant troops in Ireland were few, and they were scattered. Charles had striven to prevent the disbanding of Strafford's eight thousand papists; and after that measure was accomplished, he had intrigued to prevent the dispersion of these men. They were told to rally round their sovereign, and by defending the throne prevent the extirpation of the ancient religion.

A general rising was at length determined upon amongst some Irish chieftains and some of the ancient settlers of the Pale, for the purpose of seizing the castle of Dublin, and proclaiming that they would support the sovereign in all his rights. The plot was betrayed as far as regarded the attack upon Dublin Castle; but Ulster was in open insurrection on the 22nd of October. Sir Phelim O'Neill was at the head of thirty thousand men. What was intended to be an insurrection, for the redress of civil wrongs and the removal of religious disabilities, soon became a general massacre of Protestants. The conspirators in Ulster were rendered desperate by the failure of the plot for the seizure of Dublin. The Puritan settlers of the north were especially obnoxious to those who were in arms. They were driven from their houses in an inclement season. They fled to the hills and morasses, where they perished of hunger. They were put to death with all the horrors that only savages and fanatics can inflict. Women and children were murdered with relentless fury. Multitudes fled towards Dublin as their only city of refuge. The number of those that perished has been variously estimated. Clarendon says that "about forty or fifty thousand of the English Protestants were murdered before they suspected themselves to be in any danger, or could provide for their defence by drawing themselves into towns or strong houses."^c Troops at length arrived from England.^m

In 1642 a Scottish army under Monro landed in Ulster, and formed a rallying point for the colonists. Londonderry, Enniskillen, Coleraine, Carrickfergus, and some other places defied Sir Phelim O'Neill's tumultuary host. Trained in foreign wars, Owen Roe O'Neill gradually formed a powerful army

[^c Joyce, an Irish authority, says: "The number of victims has been wildly exaggerated; but Dr. Warner, an English writer, a Protestant clergyman who made every effort to come at the truth, believes that in the first two years of the rebellion four thousand were murdered and that eight thousand died of ill-usage and exposure."]

[1642-1645 A.D.]

among the Ulster Irish, and it is impossible to overestimate his skill and patience. But like other O'Neills he did little out of Ulster, and his great victory over Monro at Benburb on the Blackwater (1645) had no lasting results. The old English of the Pale were forced into rebellion, but could never get on with the native Irish, who hated them only less than the new colonists. Ormonde throughout maintained the position of a loyal subject, and as the king's representative played a great but hopeless part. The Celts cared nothing for the king except as a weapon against the Protestants; the old Anglo-Irish Catholics cared much, but the nearer Charles approached them the more completely he alienated the Protestants.



CROMWELL'S BRIDGE, GLENGARIFF

In 1645 Rinuccini reached Ireland as papal legate. He could never co-operate with the Catholic confederacy at Kilkenny, which was under old English influence, and by throwing in his lot with the Celts only widened the gulf between the two sections. The royalist confederates were not willing to decide the question of investitures in favour of the pope, still less to restore the abbey lands of which they were the chief holders.

Whatever may be thought of Mr. Carlyle's judgments on Ireland generally, he has thoroughly mastered the state of parties during the turmoil which followed 1641. "There are," he says, "Catholics of the Pale, demanding freedom of religion, under my lord this and my lord that. There are old-Irish Catholics, under pope's nuncios, under Abba O'Teague of the excommunications, and Owen Roe O'Neill, demanding not religious freedom only, but what we now call 'repeal of the union,' and unable to agree with Catholics of the English Pale. Then there are Ormonde royalists, of the Episcopalian and mixed creeds, strong for king

without covenant; Ulster and other Presbyterians strong for king and covenant; lastly, Michael Jones and the commonwealth of England, who want neither king nor covenant."

In all their negotiations with Ormonde and Glamorgan, Henrietta Maria and Digby, the pope and Rinuccini stood out for an arrangement which could have destroyed the royal supremacy and established Romanism in Ireland, leaving to the Anglicans bare toleration, and to the Presbyterians not even that. Charles behaved after his kind, showing not only his falseness but also his total want of real dignity. Ormonde was forced to surrender Dublin to

[¹ During this bitter period of religious strife there was little difference between Puritan and Catholic in the intensity of feeling. As an illustration of the Puritan attitude listen to the denunciation of the Irish rebels uttered by Nathaniel Ward, a New England minister (1647): "Cursed be he that holdeth back his sword from blood, yea, cursed be he that maketh not his sword starke drunk with Irish blood."]

[1646-1651 A.D.]

the parliamentarians (1646), and the inextricable knot awaited Cromwell's sword.^b

In England the parliament had triumphed. The death of the king caused somewhat of a counter-movement in Ireland; and the royalist cause was now (1649) sustained by the confederates, with Ormonde the lord-lieutenant, and Inchiquin at their head, and by the Scots of Ulster. They proclaimed the prince of Wales king as Charles II.

CROMWELL IN IRELAND

Oliver Cromwell was appointed lord-lieutenant and commander of the forces in Ireland, and landed at Dublin on the 14th of August, 1649, with nine thousand foot, four thousand horse, a supply of military stores, and £20,000 in money, accompanied by his son-in-law, Ireton, as second in command. He issued a proclamation against plunder, ordering that all supplies taken from the natives should be paid for.

He first proceeded against Drogheda. It had been garrisoned by Ormonde with three thousand troops, chiefly English, under Sir Arthur Ashton. Cromwell began by battering down the steeple of St. Mary's church. Next day, the 10th of September, 1649, the cannonade continued, till towards evening two breaches were made. Two desperate attempts to enter were repulsed; but the third succeeded; and immediately, on Cromwell's order, the whole garrison, including the commander, Sir Arthur Ashton, with many friars and townspeople, were massacred. After this, Trim, Dundalk, Carlingford, Newry, and several other places in the north surrendered.

Cromwell returned to Dublin, and marching south, appeared before Wexford. It was well fortified and garrisoned with three thousand men, under the command of David Sinnott. Cromwell began his cannonade on the 11th of October, and when some breaches had been made, Sinnott asked for a parley. But meantime the commander of the strong castle just outside the walls treacherously delivered it up to Cromwell's troops. This enabled a party of the besiegers to get into the town and open the gates. The garrison retreated to the market place, where they found the townspeople congregated. Here they defended themselves in desperation for an hour, but were overpowered by numbers; and Cromwell's soldiers under his orders killed garrison and townspeople without distinction to the number of two thousand (11th of October, 1649).

The fate of Drogheda and Wexford struck the Irish with terror; and many towns now yielded on mere summons. Cromwell, seeing the country virtually subdued, sailed for England on the 29th of May, 1650, leaving Ireton to finish the war. In August Preston surrendered Waterford.

While the confederates were loyally fighting for the young king Charles, who was at this time in Scotland, he, in order to gain the favour of the Scots, repudiated any agreement with the Irish, and declared himself against allowing them liberty to practise their religion. The Irish distrusted both Ormonde and Inchiquin, both of whom had mismanaged the war, and who were suspected of intriguing with the parliament; and Ormonde, finding he had lost the confidence of the Catholics, sailed from Galway for St. Malo in December, leaving Lord Clanrickard as his deputy.

Limerick, the most important place in possession of the royalists, was next to be attacked. It was commanded by Hugh O'Neill, the cousin of Owen Roe, who had died in the previous year. By forcing the passage of the Shannon at O'Brien's Bridge, Ireton got at the Clare side of the city, which

[1651-1660 A.D.]

was now invested on both sides. O'Neill defended the city with great bravery; but there was disunion, and he was not supported by the magistrates; and the plague was raging among the citizens. At length Colonel Fennell betrayed his trust by opening the gates to Ireton, who took possession on the 27th of October, 1651. The garrison of two thousand five hundred laid down their arms and were allowed to march away unmolested.

Ireton caused several of the prominent defenders to be executed, among them Dr. O'Brien, bishop of Emly; but he was himself killed by the plague within the same month. The traitor Fennell was hanged with the others.

After Ireton's death Lieutenant-general Edmund Ludlow, taking command, marched to the aid of Coote at Galway, which surrendered on the 12th of May, 1652, after a siege of nine months. The capture of a few detached castles



CASTLE IN LIMERICK

completed the conquest of Ireland by the parliamentarians. Charles Fleetwood, Cromwell's son-in-law (he had married Ireton's widow) took command of the army in succession to Ludlow, and was afterwards appointed lord deputy. Under his direction a high court of justice was instituted in October, 1652, to punish those who had been concerned in the rising of 1641; about two hundred were sentenced and hanged, among them Sir Phelim O'Neill.⁴

Cromwell's civil policy, to use Macaulay's words, was "able, straightforward, and cruel." He thinned the disaffected population by allowing foreign enlistment, and forty thousand are said to have been thus got rid of. Already Irish Catholics of good family had learned to offer their swords to foreign princes. In Spain, France, and the empire they often rose to the distinction which they were denied at home. About nine thousand persons were sent to the West Indies, practically into slavery. Thus, and by the long war, the population was reduced to some eight hundred and fifty thousand, of whom one hundred and fifty thousand were English and Scots; the marvel is that so many were left.

Then came the transplantation beyond the Shannon. The Irish Catholic gentry were removed bodily with their servants and such tenants as consented to follow them, and with what remained of their cattle. They suffered dreadful hardships. The derelict property in the other provinces was divided between adventurers who had advanced money and soldiers who had fought in Ireland. Many of the latter sold their claims to officers or speculators,

[1652-1666 A.D.]

who were thus enabled to form estates. The majority of Irish labourers stayed to work under the settlers, and the country became peaceful and prosperous. Some fighting Catholics haunted woods and hills under the name of tories, afterwards given in derision to a great party, and were hunted down with as little compunction as the wolves to which they were compared. Measures of great severity were taken against Catholic priests; but it is said that Cromwell had great numbers in his pay, and that they kept him well informed. All classes of Protestants were tolerated, and Jeremy Taylor preached unmolested. Commercial equality being given to Ireland, the woollen trade at once revived, and a shipping interest sprang up. Were it worth while to prove Cromwell a greater statesman than Strafford, his religious and commercial policy in Ireland would supply ample evidence

THE RESTORATION

Charles II was bound in honour to do something for such Irish Catholics as were innocent of the massacres of 1641, and the claims were not scrutinised too severely. It was found impossible to displace the Cromwellians, but they were shorn of about one-third of their lands. When the Caroline settlement was complete it was found that the great rebellion had resulted in reducing the Catholic share of the fertile parts of Ireland from two-thirds to one-third. Ormonde was largely and deservedly rewarded. A revenue of £30,000 was settled on the king, in consideration of which Ireland was in 1663 excluded from the benefit of the Navigation Act, and her nascent shipping interests ruined.

In 1666 the importation of Irish cattle and horses into England was forbidden, the value of the former at once falling fivefold, of the latter twentyfold. Among other arguments in favour of this atrocious law was that used by Ashley, who said that if the bill did not pass, the duke of Ormonde would have a greater estate than the earl of Northumberland. "Achitophel" must have laughed in his sleeve. Buckingham said every opponent of the bill must have "an Irish estate or an Irish understanding," which nearly cost him a duel with Ormonde, and much damaged his reputation for courage. That such a man as Buckingham should have so taunted such a man as Ormonde is characteristic of the most shameless reign in our history. Dead meat, butter, and cheese were also excluded, yet peace brought a certain prosperity. The woollen manufacture grew and flourished, and Macaulay is probably warranted in saying that under Charles II Ireland was a pleasanter place of residence than it has been before or since. But it was pleasant only for those who conformed to the state religion. Catholicism was tolerated, or rather connived at; but its professors were subject to frequent alarms and to great severities during the reign of Titus Oates. Bramhall became primate, and his hand was heavy against the Ulster Presbyterians.

It is humiliating to record that Jeremy Taylor began a persecution which stopped the influx of Scots into Ireland. Deprived of the means of teaching, the Independents and other sectaries soon disappeared. In a military colony women were scarce, and the "Ironsides" had married natives. To use their own language, they saw the daughters of Moab that they were fair. Women are more religious than men, travelling missionaries more zealous than endowed clerks; and Catholicism held its own. The Quakers became numerous during this reign, and their peaceful industry was most useful. They venerate as their founder Thomas Edmundson, a Westmoreland man who had borne arms for the parliament, and who settled in Antrim in 1652.

JAMES II: LONDONDERRY AND THE BOYNE

The duke of Ormonde was lord-lieutenant at the death of Charles II. At seventy-five his brain was as clear as ever, and James saw that he was no fit tool for his purpose. "See, gentlemen," said the old chief, lifting his glass at a military dinner party, "they say at court I am old and doting. But my hand is steady, nor doth my heart fail. To the king's health!" Calculating on his loyal subservience, James appointed his brother-in-law, Lord Clarendon, to succeed Ormonde.^a Monmouth's enterprise made no stir, but gave an excuse for disarming the Protestant militia. The Tories at once emerged from their hiding-places, and Clarendon found Ireland in a ferment.

It was now the turn of the Protestants to feel what persecution means. Richard Talbot, one of the few survivors of Drogheda, governed the king's Irish policy, while the lord-lieutenant was kept in the dark. Finally Talbot, created earl of Tyrconnel, himself received the sword of state. Protestants were weeded out of the army, Protestant officers in particular being superseded by idle Catholics of gentle blood, where they could be found, and in any case by Catholics. Bigotry rather than religion was Tyrconnel's ruling passion, and he filled up offices with Catholics independently of character. Fitton, a man convicted of forgery, became chancellor, and but three Protestant judges were left on the bench. The outlawries growing out of the affairs of 1641 were reversed as quickly as possible. Protestant corporations were dissolved by *quo warrantos*; but James was still Englishman enough to refuse an Irish parliament, which might repeal Poynings' Act and the Act of Settlement.

In 1687 the Church of England discovered that there were limits to passive obedience, and at the close of the following year James was a fugitive in France. By this time Londonderry and Enniskillen had closed their gates, and the final struggle had begun. In March, 1689, James reached Ireland with some French troops, and summoned a parliament which repealed the Act of Settlement [and Poynings' Law]. The estates of absentees were vested in the crown, and as only two months' law was given, this was nearly equivalent to confiscating the property of all Protestants. Between two thousand and three thousand Protestants were attainted by name, and moreover, the act was not published. The dispossessed Protestants escaped by sea or flocked into Ulster, where a gallant stand was made. The glories of Londonderry and Enniskillen will live as long as the English language.^b

The siege of Londonderry, which had been commenced on the 18th of April, 1689, was carried on in good earnest by Richard Hamilton, who was afterwards joined by Count de Rosen. At the first approach of the enemy the gates had been shut by a few young apprentices. But there were many among the authorities who did not approve of this action; and Colonel Lundy, the governor, had from the beginning made himself intensely unpopular by recommending surrender, so that he had at last to make his escape over the wall by night in disguise.

The command then devolved on Major Baker and Captain Murray. The feeble-hearted town council were still for surrender; when the humbler citizens—those of the class who at first had shut the gates—with Murray at their head, took the matter into their own hands and resolved on resistance. But

[^a In the later days of his lord-lieutenancy Ormonde realised his lack of real power. "I have no friends but God and your grace," said a suitor for court favour to him. "Poor man," returned the duke, "you could not have two friends who have less influence at court."]

[1689 A.D.]

the life and soul of the place was the Rev. George Walker, a Protestant clergyman, who by ceaseless activity and constant exhortation, both from pulpit and rampart, roused the energies of the defenders and kept up the drooping spirits of the people. He succeeded to the chief command on the death of Baker; and to him was mainly due the final success of this most obstinate defence.

During May and June the fighting went on daily; there were sallies by the besieged, and attempts to storm by the besiegers, with desperate conflicts and great loss of life. Such was the spirit of the defenders that the women sometimes assisted, handing ammunition and refreshments to the men; and armed with stones and all sorts of first-to-hand missiles, they mixed in the fights as boldly as their sons, brothers, and husbands. But soon provisions began to run short; and there was no way of procuring a supply, for the town was quite surrounded except on the river side, and here the besiegers had cut off communication by a great boom composed of strong cables and logs of timber bound together, stretched tightly from bank to bank.¹

Every day watchmen took station on the church tower, anxiously looking out to sea for relief; and at length in the middle of June they shouted down the joyous news that thirty ships were sailing up Lough Foyle. But the hopes of the citizens were short-lived, for Major-General Kirke, the commander of the fleet, hearing of the boom and of the armed enemies and forts lining the river banks all the way up to the town, refused to proceed farther.

For forty-six days he lay idle in the lough, while the townspeople were famishing, driven to eat horseflesh, dogs, grease, and garbage of every kind. The garrison fared no better. Yet these brave young fellows—ragged and starving—stood resolutely to their posts and had never a thought of yielding. The fighting at last ceased, and it now became a question of starving the defenders into surrender.

On the evening of the 30th of July, when silence, gloom, and despair had settled down on the town, the watchers were startled by a bright flash down



WALLS OF LONDONDERRY

Walker's Pillar

[¹ "The king at this time went up to Dublin to hold his parliament, leaving the command with the Flemish general De Rosen. This officer, inured to his master's barbarous dealings with his own subjects as well as foreigners, and incensed at the gallant resistance of the besieged, sent out parties of dragoons, and collecting all the Protestants, men, women, and children, within a circuit of thirty miles, to the number of four thousand, drove them under the walls of Derry, there to perish if the garrison did not surrender. The king, who had given protection to most of these people, sent orders to the general to desist; but his mandate was unheeded; the threat of the garrison to hang all of their prisoners was of more avail; and after three days' starvation, the poor people were permitted to return to their homes, which had meantime been plundered. Several hundreds of them died with fatigue and hunger."—KEIGHTLEY.]

[1689-1690 A.D.]

the river, followed by the roar of artillery; and a hungry multitude, rushing eagerly to the battlements, saw relief approaching. For Kirke had at last taken heart and sent three ships with provisions. In spite of the destructive fire from both sides, the ships approached full sail, crashed through the boom, and relieved the town. Next day Hamilton marched away. Thus ended, on the 31st of July, 1689, a siege of one hundred and five days, one of the most famous in Irish or British history.

Enniskillen, the other Williamite garrison, was threatened by the approach of an Irish army; but the Enniskilleners, marching forth on the very day of the relief of Londonderry, intercepted and utterly defeated them at Newtownbutler. Sarsfield, who commanded a detachment at Sligo, on hearing of these disasters, retired to Athlone; and now Ulster was nearly all in the hands of the Williamites.

THE BATTLE OF THE BOYNE (1690 A.D.)

The siege of Londonderry was only the beginning of the struggle. King William had now leisure to look to Ireland; and he sent over the duke of Schomberg—then over eighty years of age—who landed in August, 1689, at Bangor, with an army of about fifteen thousand men. After a siege of eight days Carrickfergus Castle was surrendered to him; and he settled down for some time in an intrenched camp near Dundalk, in an unhealthy position, where he lost a large part of his army by sickness.



SCHOMBERG HOUSE, PALL MALL

In the following year King William came over to conduct the campaign in person. He landed at Carrickfergus on the 14th of June, 1690, and immediately joined Schomberg. About half of the united army were foreigners, excellent soldiers, a mixture of French, Dutch, Danes, Swedes, and Prussians or Brandenburgers.

James had advanced from Dublin to Dundalk, but fell back on the south bank of the Boyne, with his centre at the village of Oldbridge, whither William followed him and took up his position on the north bank. He had about thirty-six thousand men; James about thirty thousand. The Irish army was largely composed of recruits, badly drilled and badly armed, with the unskilful and irresolute King James at their head; they were opposed by a more numerous army, well trained, well supplied with all necessaries, and commanded by

William, a man of determination, and one of the best generals of the time.

On the evening of the 30th of June King William, while reconnoitring, was slightly wounded by a cannon shot from the opposite side, and the report went round among the Irish that he was killed.^d

The first of July dawned, a day which has never since returned without exciting strong emotions of very different kinds in the two populations which divide Ireland. The sun rose bright and cloudless. Soon after four both

[1689-1690 A.D.]

armies were in motion. William ordered his right wing, under the command of Meinhart Schomberg, one of the duke's sons, to march to the bridge of Slane, some miles up the river, to cross there, and to turn the left flank of the Irish army. Meinhart Schomberg was assisted by Portland and Douglas. James, anticipating some such design, had already sent to the bridge a regiment of dragoons, commanded by Sir Neil O'Neill. O'Neill behaved himself like a brave gentleman; but he soon received a mortal wound: his men fled, and the English right wing passed the river.

This move made Lauzun uneasy. What if the English right wing should get into the rear of the army of James? About four miles south of the Boyne was a place called Duleek, where the road to Dublin was so narrow that two cars could not pass each other, and where on both sides of the road lay a morass which afforded no firm footing. If Meinhart Schomberg should occupy this spot, it would be impossible for the Irish to retreat. They must either conquer, or be cut off to a man. Disturbed by this apprehension the French general marched with his countrymen and with Sarsfield's horse in the direction of Slane Bridge. Thus the fords near Oldbridge were left to be defended by the Irish alone.

It was now near ten o'clock. William put himself at the head of his left wing, which was composed exclusively of cavalry, and prepared to pass the river not far above Drogheda. The centre of his army, which consisted almost exclusively of foot, was intrusted to the command of Schomberg, and was marshalled opposite to Oldbridge. At Oldbridge the whole Irish infantry had been collected. The Meath bank bristled with pikes and bayonets. A fortification had been made by French engineers out of the hedges and buildings; and a breastwork had been thrown up close to the water side. Tyrconnell was there; and under him were Richard Hamilton and Antrim.

Schomberg gave the word. Solmes' Blues were the first to move. They marched gallantly, with drums beating, to the brink of the Boyne. Then the drums stopped; and the men, ten abreast, descended into the water. Next plunged Londonderry and Enniskillen. A little to the left of Londonderry and Enniskillen, Caillemot crossed, at the head of a long column of French refugees. A little to the left of Caillemot and his refugees, the main body of the English infantry struggled through the river, up to the armpits in water. Still further down the stream the Danes found another ford. In a few minutes the Boyne, for a quarter of a mile, was alive with muskets and green boughs.

It was not till the assailants had reached the middle of the channel that they became aware of the whole difficulty and danger of the service in which they were engaged. They had as yet seen little more than half the hostile army. Now whole regiments of foot and horse seemed to start out of the earth. A wild shout of defiance rose from the whole shore: during one moment the event seemed doubtful; but the Protestants pressed resolutely forward, and in another moment the whole Irish line gave way. Tyrconnell looked on in helpless despair. He did not want personal courage; but his military skill was so small that he hardly ever reviewed his regiment in the Phoenix Park without committing some blunder; and to rally the ranks which were breaking all around him was no task for a general who had survived the energy of his body and of his mind, and yet had still the rudiments of his profession to learn. Several of his best officers fell while vainly endeavouring to prevail on their soldiers to look the Dutch Blues in the face. Richard Hamilton ordered a body of foot to fall on the French refugees, who were still deep in water. He led the way, and, accompanied by several courageous gentlemen,

[1690 A.D.]

advanced, sword in hand, into the river. But neither his commands nor his example could infuse courage into that mob of cow stealers. He was left almost alone, and retired from the bank in despair. Further down the river Antrim's division ran like sheep at the approach of the English column. Whole regiments flung away arms, colours and cloaks, and scampered off to the hills without striking a blow or firing a shot.

It required many years and many heroic exploits to take away the reproach which that ignominious rout left on the Irish name. Yet, even before the day closed it was abundantly proved that the reproach was unjust. Richard Hamilton put himself at the head of the cavalry, and under his command they made a gallant though an unsuccessful attempt to retrieve the day. They maintained a desperate fight in the bed of the river with Solmes' Blues. They drove the Danish brigade back into the stream. They fell impetuously on the Huguenot regiments, which, not being provided with pikes, then ordinarily used by foot to repel horse, began to give ground. Caillemot, while encouraging his fellow exiles, received a mortal wound in the thigh. Four of his men carried him back across the ford to his tent. As he passed, he continued to urge forward the rear ranks which were still up to the breast in the water. "On, on, my lads! to glory! to glory!"

Schomberg, who had remained on the northern bank, and who had thence watched the progress of his troops with the eye of a general, now thought that the emergency required from him the personal exertion of a soldier. Those who stood about him besought him in vain to put on his cuirass. Without defensive armour he rode through the river, and rallied the refugees whom the fall of Caillemot had dismayed. "Come on," he cried in French, pointing to the popish squadrons; "come on, gentlemen: there are your persecutors." Those were his last words. As he spoke a band of Irish horsemen rushed upon him and encircled him for a moment. When they retired, he was on the ground. His friends raised him, but he was already a corpse. Two sabre wounds were on his head, and a bullet from a carbine was lodged in his neck. Almost at the same moment Dr. Walker [whom William had created bishop of Derry], while exhorting the colonists of Ulster to play the men, was shot dead.

During near half an hour the battle continued to rage along the southern shore of the river. All was smoke, dust, and din. Old soldiers were heard to say that they had seldom seen sharper work in the Low Countries. But just at this conjuncture William came up with the left wing. He had found much difficulty in crossing. The tide was running fast. His charger had been forced to swim, and had been almost lost in the mud. As soon as the king was on firm ground he took his sword in his left hand—for his right arm was stiff with his wound and his bandage—and led his men to the place where the fight was the hottest. His arrival decided the fate of the day. Yet the Irish horse retired fighting obstinately. It was long remembered among the Protestants of Ulster that in the midst of the tumult William rode to the head of the Enniskilleners. "What will you do for me?" he cried. He was not immediately recognised; and one trooper, taking him for an enemy, was about to fire. William gently put aside the carbine. "What," said he, "do you not know your friends?" "It is his majesty," said the colonel. The ranks of sturdy Protestant yeomen set up a shout of joy. "Gentlemen," said William, "you shall be my guards to-day. I have heard much of you. Let me see something of you." One of the most remarkable peculiarities of this man, ordinarily so saturnine and reserved, was that danger acted on him like wine, opened his heart, loosened his tongue, and took away

[1690 A.D.]

all appearance of constraint from his manner. On this memorable day he was seen wherever the peril was greatest. One ball struck the cap of his pistol: another carried off the heel of his jackboot; but his lieutenants in vain implored him to retire to some station from which he could give his orders without exposing a life so valuable to Europe.

His troops, animated by his example, gained ground fast. The Irish cavalry made their last stand at a house called Plottin Castle, about a mile and a half south of Oldbridge. There the Enniskilleners were repelled with the loss of fifty men, and were hotly pursued, till William rallied them and turned the chase back. In this encounter Richard Hamilton, who had done all that could be done by valour to retrieve a reputation forfeited by perfidy, was severely wounded, taken prisoner, and instantly brought, through the smoke and over the carnage, before the prince whom he had foully wronged. On no occasion did the character of William show itself in a more striking manner. "Is this business over?" he said; "or will your horse make more fight?" "On my honour, sir," answered Hamilton, "I believe that they will." "Your honour!" muttered William; "your honour!" That half-suppressed exclamation was the only revenge which he condescended to take for an injury for which many sovereigns, far more affable and gracious in their ordinary deportment, would have exacted a terrible retribution. Then, restraining himself, he ordered his own surgeon to look to the hurts of the captive.

And now the battle was over. Hamilton was mistaken in thinking that his horse would continue to fight. Whole troops had been cut to pieces. One fine regiment had only thirty unwounded men left. It was enough that these gallant soldiers had disputed the field till they were left without support, or hope, or guidance, till their bravest leader was a captive, and till their king had fled.

James, from the secure position which he occupied on the height of Donore, saw his rival, weak, sickly, wounded, swimming the river, struggling though the mud, leading the charge, stopping the flight, grasping the sword with the left hand, managing the bridle with a bandaged arm. But none of these things moved that sluggish and ignoble nature. He watched, from a safe distance, the beginning of the battle on which his fate and the fate of his race depended. When it became clear that the day was going against Ireland, he was seized with an apprehension that his flight might be intercepted and galloped towards Dublin.¹

The French auxiliaries who had been employed the whole morning in keeping William's right wing in check, covered the flight of the beaten army. They were indeed in some danger of being broken and swept away by the torrent of runaways, all pressing to get first to the pass of Duleek, and were forced to fire repeatedly on these despicable allies. The retreat was however effected with less loss than might have been expected; for even the admirers of William owned that he did not show in the pursuit the energy which even his detractors acknowledged he had shown in the battle. Perhaps his physical infirmities, his hurt, and the fatigue which he had undergone, had made him incapable of bodily or mental exertion. Of the last forty hours he had passed thirty-five on horseback. Schomberg, who might have supplied his place, was no more. It was said in the camp that the king could

[¹ The Irish repaid the king who so basely deserted them in their hour of need by the opprobrious epithet—"Sheemas a Cacagh"—"Dirty James." Stung by defeat, the brave Sarsfield is reported to have said to an Englishman after the battle of the Boyne, "Change kings and we will fight you over again."]

not do everything, and that what was not done by him was not done at all.

The slaughter had been less than on any battlefield of equal importance and celebrity. Of the Irish only about fifteen hundred had fallen; but they were almost all cavalry, the flower of the army, brave and well-disciplined men, whose place could not easily be supplied. William gave strict orders that there should be no unnecessary bloodshed, and enforced those orders by an act of laudable severity. One of his soldiers, after the fight was over, butchered three defenceless Irishmen who asked for quarter. The king ordered the murderer to be hanged on the spot.

The loss of the conquerors did not exceed five hundred men; but among them was the first captain in Europe. To his corpse every honour was paid. The only cemetery in which so illustrious a warrior, slain in arms for the liberties and religion of England, could properly be laid was that venerable abbey, hallowed by the dust of many generations of princes, heroes, and poets. It was announced that the brave veteran should have a public funeral at Westminster. Walker was treated less respectfully. William thought him a busybody who had been properly punished for running into danger without any call of duty, and expressed that feeling with characteristic bluntness on the field of battle. "Sir," said an attendant, "the bishop of Derry has been killed by a shot at the ford." "What took him there?" growled the king.

Having given the chief command to Tyrconnel, James embarked at Kinsale and landed at Brest, the first bearer of the news of his own defeat. The Irish army evacuated Dublin and marched to Limerick; and William arrived and took possession of the city on Sunday the 6th of July. After this, Drogheda, Kilkenny, Duncannon, and Waterford surrendered in quick succession.

THE SIEGE AND PEACE OF LIMERICK (1690 A.D.)

The Irish now took the Shannon for their line of defence and concentrated their forces at Limerick and Athlone. William marched towards Limerick. Douglas attacked Athlone with twelve thousand men; but after a siege of seven days he was repulsed, and joined the king at Limerick.

On the 9th of August, 1690, William encamped at Singland, just outside the walls of the old city, with an effective army of about twenty-six thousand; the Irish army of defence numbered about twenty-five thousand, only half of them armed. The city was badly prepared for defence: the French general Lauzun said, "it could be taken with roasted apples"; and deserting his post, marched to Galway and embarked for France.

William was deficient in artillery; but a great siege train was on its way from Dublin, with heavy cannons, plenty of ammunition, and other necessities for a siege.

When General Patrick Sarsfield came to hear of this, he determined to intercept the convoy. Marching out silently at dead of night at the Clare side with six hundred picked horsemen, he rode to Killaloe, fifteen miles above Limerick, and crossed the Shannon at an unguarded ford a little above the town.

Turning southeast, and having given his party a brief rest, he came on the convoy on the next night towards morning, beside the ruined castle of Ballyneety, near the village of Oola. All were asleep except a few sentinels, and the attack was a complete surprise. When the party of horse dashed in among them there was little resistance, and in a few minutes Sarsfield had possession of the whole train. He caused the cannons to be filled with powder and their mouths buried in the earth; a fuse was laid to magazine and cannon,

[1690 A.D.]

and the whole train was blown up in one terrific explosion. A part of William's army heard the ominous rumble in the distance, and too well divined what it meant. Sarsfield, successfully eluding a party sent out too late to intercept him, made his way safely back to the city. This brilliant exploit greatly raised the spirits of the besieged.

Notwithstanding this disaster King William, sending to Waterford for more heavy cannon, pressed the siege. The men worked at the trenches, which, in spite of the most determined opposition, were advanced within a few feet of the walls. The cannons made a great breach near St. John's Gate; and through this it was determined to make an assault.

In the afternoon of the 27th of August, 1690, a storming party, leaping up from the trenches, entered the breach, supported in the rear by ten thousand men. They fired their muskets and threw their hand grenades among the defenders, but were met by a terrible fire from all sides, front and flanks. Nearly all the front ranks were destroyed, and the rest showed signs of wavering; but thousands of resolute men pressed on from behind, and the Limerick men, now sore pressed, began to yield in their turn.

From every convenient standpoint the citizens viewed the terrible fight, but could see little through the thick cloud of smoke and dust. When they became aware that the assailants were prevailing, they rushed down in crowds from their secure resting-places, and seizing every available weapon, joined eagerly in the fray. Even the women—more active even than the women of



BLARNEY CASTLE, CORK

Derry—rushed to the very front, and regardless of danger, flung stones and bottles and missiles of every kind in the very faces of the assailants. The Brandenburg regiment, fighting steadily, had advanced to the Black Battery, and were swarming round and over it; when suddenly the magazine was exploded, and battery and Brandenburgers were blown into the air in horrible confusion.

For four hours this dreadful conflict raged, and a cloud of smoke and dust, wafted by a gentle breeze, reached the whole way to the top of Keeper Hill, sixteen miles off. The assailants, unable to withstand the tremendous and unexpected resistance, at last yielded, and turning round, rushed back through the breach in headlong confusion. King William had witnessed the conflict from Cromwell's fort; and having seen the repulse of his best troops, he returned to the camp deeply disappointed. Over two thousand of his men were killed or wounded; the loss of the Irish was comparatively small.

William raised the siege, which had lasted three weeks, and returned to England, leaving General Van Ginckell in command; and on the 31st of

[1690-1698 A.D.]

August the army marched away from the city. The heroic defenders of Limerick had, almost without ammunition, repulsed a well-equipped veteran army directed by a great general who had never been foiled before.^a

In September, 1690, John Churchill, afterwards the celebrated duke of Marlborough, captured Cork. Early in the next year the English under General Van Ginckell captured Athlone, and at Aughrim defeated a French force under St. Ruth, who was slain. Tyrconnel died in August, 1691, and Sarsfield succeeded to the chief command. In the same month Ginckell began again the siege of Limerick. After a short defence Sarsfield felt that no further help could be expected, a truce was arranged, articles of capitulation were signed on October 3rd, and the war of the revolution was over.^a

A few days afterwards [and before the city had been actually handed over to the English] a French fleet sailed up the Shannon: eighteen ships of the line and twenty transports, with three thousand soldiers, two hundred officers, and arms and ammunition for ten thousand men; but Sarsfield refused to receive them, and honourably stood by the treaty.

The Treaty of Limerick contained fifty-two articles. The most important of the civil articles were: The Irish Catholics were to have the same liberty of worship as they enjoyed in the reign of Charles II. Those in arms for King James to retain the estates they possessed in the time of Charles II, and to be permitted to freely exercise their callings and professions. The oath to be taken by the Roman Catholics who submitted to be the oath of allegiance merely, not the oath of supremacy.

The principal military articles were: The garrison to be permitted to march out of the city with arms and baggage, drums beating and colours flying. Those officers and soldiers who wished might go to any foreign country, the government to provide them with ships; those who chose might join the army of William and Mary. Ginckell was anxious to keep those fine soldiers in the king's army, but only one thousand joined, and two thousand got passes for their homes.

More than twenty thousand—among them Sarsfield—went to Brest and entered the French service. These formed the nucleus of the famous Irish Brigade, who afterwards distinguished themselves in many a battlefield—Fontenoy, Ramillies, Blenheim, Landen. Numbers of the gentry attained distinguished positions on the Continent. Sarsfield, after brilliant service, fell mortally wounded at the battle of Landen in 1693, where he commanded the left wing of the French army. It is stated that while lying on the ground, seeing his hand stained with his own blood, he exclaimed, "Oh, that this was for Ireland!" There was at this time and for long after a vast exodus of the very flower of the Irish people; and between 1691 and 1745 it is reckoned that four hundred and fifty thousand Irishmen entered the service of France and other foreign countries.^a

WILLIAM III: THE PENAL LAWS

Irish rhetoric commonly styles Limerick "the city of the violated treaty"; from the first its interpretation was disputed. Hopes of religious liberty were held out, but were not fulfilled. Lords justices Porter and Coningsby promised

[^a Many of these wandering soldiers of fortune or their descendants attained high positions in their adopted countries. Among them, to mention only a few, were: Leopold O'Donnell, duke of Tetuan, premier of Spain; Count Taaffe, premier of Austria (1879-98); O'Higgins, the liberator of Chili; President MacMahon of France, and General Keller, the Russian general killed in the Manchurian campaign in the Russo-Japanese war, July, 1904.]

[1693-1704 A.D.]

to do their utmost to obtain a parliamentary ratification, but the Irish parliament would not be persuaded. There was a paragraph in the original draft which would have protected the property of the great majority of Catholics, but this was left out in the articles actually signed. William thought the omission accidental, but this is hardly possible. At all events, he ratified the treaty in the sense most favourable to the Catholics, while the Irish parliament adhered to the letter of the document.

Perhaps no breach of faith was intended, but the sorrowful fact remains that the modern settlement of Ireland has the appearance of resting on a broken promise. More than one million Irish acres were forfeited, and, though some part returned to Catholic owners, the Catholic interest in the land was further diminished. William III was the most liberally minded man in his dominions; but the necessities of his position—such is the awful penalty of greatness—forced him into intolerance against his will, and he promised to discourage the Irish woollen trade. His manner of disposing of the Irish forfeitures was inexcusable. Grants to Bentinck, Ruvigny, and Ginckell may be defended, but not that to Elizabeth Villiers, countess of Orkney, the king's former mistress.

The lands were resumed by the English parliament, less perhaps from a sense of justice than from a desire to humiliate the deliverer of England, and were resold to the highest bidder. Nevertheless, it became the fashion to reward nameless English services at the expense of Ireland. Pensions and sinecures which would not bear the light in England were charged on the Irish establishment, and even bishoprics were given away on the same principle. The tremendous uproar raised by Swift [in his *Dropier's Letters*] about "Wood's halfpence" was heightened by the fact that Wood shared his profits with the duchess of Kendal.¹

From the first the victorious colonists determined to make another 1641 impossible, and the English government failed to moderate their severity.

In 1708 Swift declared that the Papists were politically as inconsiderable as the women and children. In 1703 the Irish parliament begged hard for a legislative union, but as that would have involved at least partial free trade the English monopolists prevented it. By Poynings' law England had a vote on all Irish legislation, and was therefore an accomplice in the penal laws. By these no Papist might teach a school or any child but his own, or send children abroad—the burden of proof lying on the accused, and the decision being left to magistrates without a jury. Mixed marriages were forbidden between persons of property, and the children might be forcibly brought up Protestants. A Papist could not be a guardian, and all wards in chancery were brought up Protestants. The Protestant eldest son of a landed proprietor might make his father tenant for life and secure his own inheritance. Among Papist children land went in compulsory gavelkind. Papists could not take longer leases than thirty-one years at two-thirds of a rack rent; they were even required to conform within six months of an inheritance accruing, on pain of being ousted by the next Protestant heir. Priests from abroad were banished, and their return declared treason. All priests were required to register and to remain in their own parishes, and informers were to be rewarded at the expense of the popish inhabitants. No Papist was allowed arms, two justices being empowered to search; and if he had a good horse any Protestant might claim it on tendering £5.

[¹ In 1723 Walpole granted to an Englishman, William Wood, a patent to coin £108,000 in debased halfpence and farthings for circulation in Ireland. The £40,000 profit was to be equally divided between Wood and the duchess of Kendal, the king's mistress.]

These laws were, of course, systematically evaded. The property of Roman Catholics was often preserved through Protestant trustees, and it is understood that faith was generally kept. Yet the attrition if slow was sure, and by the end of the century the proportion of land belonging to Roman Catholics was probably not more than one-tenth of the whole. We can see now that if the remaining Roman Catholic landlords had been encouraged they would have done much to reconcile the masses to the settlement. Individuals are seldom as bad as corporations, and the very men who made the laws against priests practically shielded them. Nothing was so odious as a priest-hunter, even among Protestants, and this form of delation doubtless did much to create the Irish horror of informing, or indeed of giving any evidence. The penal laws put a premium on hypocrisy, and many conformed only to preserve their property or to enable them to take office. Proselytising schools, though supported by public grants, entirely failed.

COMMERCIAL RESTRAINTS: THE DISSENTERS

The restraint placed by English commercial jealousy on Irish trade destroyed manufacturing industry in the south and west. Driven by the Caroline legislation against cattle into breeding sheep, Irish graziers produced the best wool in Europe. Forbidden to export it, or to work it up profitably at home, they took to smuggling, for which the indented coast gave great facilities. The enormous profits of the contraband trade with France enabled Ireland to purchase English goods to an extent greater than her whole lawful traffic. The moral effect was disastrous. The religious penal code it was thought meritorious to evade; the commercial penal code was ostentatiously defied; and both tended to make Ireland the least law-abiding country in Europe.

When William III promised to depress the Irish woollen trade, he promised to do all he could for Irish linen. England did not fulfil the second promise; still the Ulster weavers were not crushed, and their industry flourished. Some Huguenot refugees, headed by Louis Crommelin, were established by William III at Lisburn, and founded the manufacturing prosperity of Ulster. Other Huguenots attempted other industries, but commercial restraints brought them to nought. The peculiar character of the flax business has prevented it from crossing the mountains which bound the northern province. Wool was the natural staple of the south.

The Scottish Presbyterians who defended Londonderry were treated little better than the Irish Catholics who besieged it—the sacramental test of 1704 being the work of the English council rather than of the Irish parliament. In 1715 the Irish house of commons resolved that any one who should prosecute a Presbyterian for accepting a commission in the army without taking the test was an enemy to the king and to the Protestant interest. Acts of indemnity were regularly passed throughout the reign of George II, and until 1780, when the Test Act was repealed. A bare toleration had been granted in 1720. Various abuses, especially forced labour on roads which were often private jobs, caused the "Oakboys" insurrection in 1764. Eight years later the "Steelboys" rose against the exactions of absentee landlords, who often turned out Protestant yeomen to get a higher rent from Roman Catholic cottiers. The dispossessed men carried to America an undying hatred of England which had much to say to the American revolution, and that again reacted on Ireland. Lawless Protestant associations, called Peep o' Day Boys,

[1688-1791 A.D.]

terrorised the north and were the progenitors of the Orangemen (1789). Out of the rival "defenders" Ribbonism in part sprung. The United Irishmen drew from both sources (1791).

SOCIAL STATE OF IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

But the Ulster peasants were never as badly off as those of the south and west. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Raleigh's fatal gift had already become the food of the people. When Chief Baron Rice went to London in 1688 to urge the Catholic claims on James II, the hostile populace escorted him in mock state with potatoes stuck on poles. Had manufactures been given fair play in Ireland, population might have preserved some relation to capital. As it was, land became almost the only property, and the necessity of producing wool for smuggling kept the country in grass. The poor squatted where they could, receiving starvation wages, and paying exorbitant rents for their cabins, partly with their own labour. Unable to rise, the wretched people multiplied on their potato plots with perfect recklessness. During the famine which began in the winter of 1739 one-fifth of the population is supposed to have perished; yet it is hardly noticed in literature, and seems not to have touched the conscience of that English public which in 1755 subscribed £100,000 for the sufferers by the Lisbon earthquake. As might be expected where men were allowed to smuggle and forbidden to work, redress was sought in illegal combinations and secret societies. The dreaded name of "Whiteboy" was first heard in 1761, and agrarian crime has never since been long absent.

The mediæval colony in Ireland was profoundly modified by the pressure of the surrounding tribes. While partially adopting their laws and customs, the descendants of the conquerors often spoke the language of the natives, and in so doing nearly lost their own. Those who settled in Ireland after 1641 were in a very different mood. They hated, feared, and despised the Irish, and took pride in preserving their pure English speech. Molyneux and Petty, who founded the Royal Society of Dublin in 1683, were equally Englishmen, though the former was born in Ireland. Swift and Berkeley did not consider themselves Irishmen at all. Burke and Goldsmith, coming later, though they might not call themselves Englishmen, were not less free from provincialism.

It would be hard to name other four men, who, within the same period, used Shakespeare's language with equal grace and force. They were all educated at Trinity College, Dublin. The Sheridans were men of Irish race, but with the religion they adopted the literary tone of the dominant caste, which was small and exclusive, with the virtues and the vices of an aristocracy. The



EDMUND BURKE
(1729-1797)

[1778-1798 A.D.]

oratory of the day was of a high order. Handel was appreciated in Dublin at a time when it was still the fashion to decry him in London. The public buildings of the Irish capital have always been allowed great architectural merit, and private houses still preserve much evidence of a refined taste. Angelica Kauffmann worked long in Ireland; Barry and Shee were of Irish birth; and on the whole, considering the small number of educated inhabitants, it must be admitted that the Ireland of Flood and Grattan was intellectually fertile.

The volunteers extorted partial free trade (1779), but manufacturing traditions had perished, and common experience shows how hard these are to recover. The demand for union was succeeded by a craving for independence. Poynings' law was repealed, and in 1782, in Grattan's opinion, Ireland was at last a nation. The ensuing period of eighteen years is the best known in Irish history. The quarrel and reconciliation of Flood and Grattan, the kindly patriotism of Charlemont, the eloquence, the devotion, the corruption, are household words. In 1784 out of 300 members 82 formed the regular opposition, of whom 30 were the nominees of whig potentates and 52 were really elected. The majority contained 29 members considered independent, 44 who expected to be bought, 44 placemen, 12 sitting for regular government boroughs, and 12 who were supposed to support the government on public grounds. The remaining seats were proprietary, and were let to government for valuable consideration. The house of lords, composed largely of borough-mongers and controlled by political bishops, was even less independent. Only Protestant freeholders had votes, which encouraged leases for lives, about the worst kind of tenure, and the object of each proprietor was to control as many votes as possible. The necessity of finding Protestants checked subdivision for a time, but in 1793 the Roman Catholics received the franchise, and it became usual to make leases in common, so that each lessee should have a freehold interest of 40s. The landlord, indeed, had little choice, for his importance depended on the poll book. Salaries, sinecures, even commissions in the army were reserved for those who contributed to the return of some local magnate.^b

THE IRISH AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Not less through the faults of the governed than through the faults of the governors, Ireland had never enjoyed any continuance of tranquillity. After the period of the American war, when the Irish volunteers were allowed to arm themselves, the turbulence had greatly increased. Generally speaking, the period from 1778 down to 1798 had been one of concession to the Irish Roman Catholics, who formed about seven-tenths of the population. Whilst the American revolutionary war lasted, and for some years after it ceased, the disaffected Irish took their inspiration from the other side of the Atlantic, and in many instances closely imitated the proceedings of the Americans. But as soon as the eruption of the great volcano commenced in France, they fixed their eyes on that pillar of fire as that which was to lead them through night and darkness, and waves more perilous than those of the Red Sea, to the glorious light of day, and to regions more blessed than the Promised Land. From that moment the French revolutionists became the models of the leaders of the Irish reformers, some of whom, at a very early stage of the revolution in France, contemplated nothing less than a revolution in Ireland, and went over to Paris to be indoctrinated into the modes of making it, and to bargain for the assistance of the French.

[1793-1796 A.D.]

At the beginning of 1793, or almost immediately after the declaration of war against England, the ruling party in France (then Jacobin-Gironde) despatched a secret agent to Ireland to confer with the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen, and to offer them the aid of French arms for the liberation of their country. This emissary brought a letter of introduction to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, who had been dismissed from the English army for having frequented the Jacobin Club at Paris; for having been one, with Thomas Paine, and men of that stamp, at a great public dinner at Paris, where the most revolutionary and jacobinical speeches were delivered, and the hope expressed that England as well as Ireland would soon be revolutionised *à la Française*. Soon after that unlucky dinner, he became acquainted with Madame de Genlis, and married her Pamela—her own illegitimate daughter by the Duke of Orleans, or Philippe Egalité.

In 1794, when the reign of the Jacobins and of terror was at its height, another secret emissary came over from France to Ireland. This individual, a subject of the king, an Irishman by birth, and a Protestant clergyman by profession, was the Rev. William Jackson. He conferred with Wolfe Tone, and many others of the Irish revolutionists, and repeated the promises of the French to assist them "in breaking their chains." This Jackson was arrested in Dublin soon after his landing, and was tried and condemned for high treason; but he made no confessions, he left the government in the dark as to the extent of the conspiracy, and he escaped a public execution by committing suicide.

A stop was put to further concessions; and in Ireland, with at least as much reason as in England, every attempt at reform or change was reprobated. Wolfe Tone, who had fled to America, found at Philadelphia his friend Hamilton Rowan, who had also escaped from justice, a Dr. Reynolds, and other Irish patriots. Hamilton Rowan introduced Wolfe Tone to citizen Adet, the minister of the French to the American republic; and a negotiation for invading Ireland by a French army was opened forthwith.

Tone, being at length supplied with money by United Irishmen in Ireland, and furnished with a letter to the committee of *salut public* by citizen Adet, sailed for France to conclude his treaty there. He arrived at Havre-de-Grâce on the 1st of February, 1796, and found that the French "are a humane people, when they are not mad," and that he liked them, "with all their faults, and the guillotine at the head of them, a thousand times better than the English." On arriving at Paris he was received by Carnot, and by General Clarke, then a sort of secretary-at-war, and afterwards the notorious Duke de Feltre, who told him that General Hoche should sail for Ireland with an irresistible army as soon as the directory could raise money to hire and equip transports.

The directory expressed an anxiety to see some agent from the United Irishmen of a more exalted condition and of better known name and character. Lord Edward Fitzgerald, brother to the then duke of Leinster, and Arthur O'Connor, nephew of Lord Longueville, and said to be lineally descended from Roderick O'Connor, king of Connaught, readily accepted the mission at the request of the chiefs of the United Irishmen. They left Dublin at the end of May, 1796, Lord Edward being accompanied by his French wife.

They took London in their way; and during their short stay in that city Lord Edward dined at the house of an opposition peer, in company with Fox, Sheridan, and several other distinguished whigs of the Fox party. From London the secret negotiators proceeded to Hamburg, and from Hamburg

[1796-1798 A.D.]

they went to Bâle, and through Barthelemy negotiated with the directory. They were informed that an army for Ireland would soon be ready, and that Hoche would have the command of it.

After a month's stay at Bâle, O'Connor went into France to confer with Hoche, and to finish the negotiation; and Lord Edward returned to Hamburg talking on the road with his chance fellow travellers in what appears to have been the most rash and puerile style. Hoche, having full powers from the directory, very soon concluded the treaty with O'Connor, and pledged himself that the expedition should sail in the course of the autumn. Lord Edward and O'Connor soon returned to Ireland; but Tone remained to come over with Hoche and the French army. Wolfe Tone went with the expedition to Bantry Bay, running two narrow and terrible chances—the one of being taken and hanged, the other of being shipwrecked and drowned. He, however, got back safely to France.

Neither abroad nor at home in Ireland was the notion given up of another invasion. The winds of heaven had scattered the late armament, but another might be more successful. In the course of the spring of 1797, the chiefs of the United Irishmen, thinking it expedient to have a resident ambassador at Paris, despatched thither E. J. Servins, with powers to act as their accredited minister, and with instructions to negotiate, if possible, a loan of £500,000 sterling.

THE REVOLT OF 1798 A.D.

In the month of February, 1798, a most pressing letter was addressed by the so-called Irish executive to the French directory, urging them to send immediate succour, and stating that the people of all classes throughout Ireland then regimented, and partly armed, amounted to little less than three hundred thousand men. Talleyrand positively assured their agent at Paris that an expedition was getting ready in the French forts, which should certainly sail in the month of April. On the 28th of February Arthur O'Connor, Quigley or O'Coigley, an Irish priest, and Binns, an active member of the London Corresponding Society, were arrested at Margate, as they were on the point of embarking for France. A paper was found on the priest, addressed to the French directory, earnestly inviting an invasion of England, which, it was calculated, would prevent the English sending troops into Ireland. This paper, and the trial which followed, put the government in possession of many important secrets; but a great deal had been unravelled before this time. Quigley, the priest, who died protesting his innocence of treason, and who really appears to have been less deeply engaged in the conspiracy than any of them, was found guilty, and was executed on Pennenden Heath; O'Connor was remanded on another charge of high treason, and Binns was acquitted. Some arrests were forthwith ordered at Dublin, and some more papers were found in a printing office—the office where O'Connor had been publishing a revolutionary journal, called the *Press*.

But much completer revelations were now about to be made, by one of the chief revolutionists. Several obscurer members of the Association of United Irishmen had played false before; but the great secrets of the society were not intrusted to such as those; and the government was anxiously looking for some higher and more fully informed traitor to that cause, when a Mr. Thomas Reynolds, who had "Esquire" written after his name, and who lived in what was called a castle, who had been deep in all the plots and

[1798 A.D.]

intimate with most of the leading plotters, who was the nominal treasurer of a county and the appointed colonel for a regiment of the insurgent army, pretending that the United Irishmen were going much farther than he, in his innocence, had ever anticipated, and that his love of the constitution and the integrity of the empire induced him to betray his friends, but in reality being hard driven by debt, and filled with the hope of an immense reward, divulged all that he knew to a friend of the government.

A warrant from the secretary of state's office was forthwith placed in the hands of Mayor Swan, a magistrate for the county of Dublin, who, on the 12th of March, repaired to the house of Oliver Bond (a merchant, and one of the principal conspirators), where there was to be a great meeting, attended by thirteen sergeants in plain clothes, and by means of the passwords—"Where's M'Cann? Is Ivers from Carlow come?" obtained admission to the meeting, and arrested all such persons as were there assembled. Dr. M'Neven, who had been on a special commission to Paris, Thomas A. Emmet, Sampson, and Lord Edward Fitzgerald, were not at the meeting; but separate warrants being issued against them, M'Neven and Emmet were soon apprehended; Sampson fled to England, was seized at Carlisle, and brought back to Dublin; but Lord Edward Fitzgerald concealed himself in Dublin and the neighbourhood, and was not discovered till the 19th of May.

It appears that, on the part of the government at least, the search after him had not been very active, and that, on account of his noble family and his numerous friends, his escape would gladly have been connived at. But seemingly he never contemplated escaping, but employed himself all the time he was under hiding in arranging how the insurgents were to rise and march upon Dublin. He had fixed the 23rd of May for the general rising. On being surprised, lying on a bed in the house of one Murphy, on the evening of the 19th, he behaved more like a madman than a hero, savagely shedding blood without the slightest hope of fighting his way out, for the house was surrounded by pickets, and a numerous and steady garrison were under arms in the streets of Dublin. When Major Swan entered the garret and showed his warrant, he sprang up like a tiger. Swan, to stop his attack, fired a pocket-pistol at him, but without effect. A soldier now entered, and at that instant Lord Edward ran at Swan with a dagger which had been concealed in his bed.

Mr. Ryan, a magistrate, next entered, armed only with a sword-cane, and presently received a mortal wound from Lord Edward's dagger. Major Sirr, the active town-major who had been setting the pickets, next rushed into the room, where he found Lord Edward, a very tall and powerful man, struggling between Swan and Ryan, Ryan being on the ground weltering in his blood, but still clinging, like Swan, who was also bleeding and wounded in several places, to his adversary. Major Sirr, threatened by the bloody dagger, took a deliberate aim, and lodged the contents of a pistol in Lord Edward's right shoulder. A number of soldiers followed Sirr upstairs, and after a maniacal struggle Lord Edward was disarmed and bound, carried to the castle, and thence to Newgate. Ryan died of his wounds on the 23rd of May; Lord Edward died of his wounds, or fever brought on by them and his anxiety of mind, on the 5th of June; Swan recovered from the frightful gashes he had received.

In spite of the fall of Lord Edward, who was to have been their commander-in-chief, and in spite of the flight or arrest of every member of the directory or executive, the Irish flew to arms in various places on the appointed 23rd of May. On the 24th they made an abortive attempt on Naas, Carlow, and

[1798 A.D.]

some other towns. But on the 25th an army of fourteen thousand or more pikemen, headed by a Father John Murphy, marched to Wexford, defeated part of the garrison that sallied out to meet them, killed all the prisoners they took, and terrified the town of Wexford into a surrender on the 30th. Encouraged by these and other trifling advantages, the rebels made a rush at New Ross, took part of the town, began to plunder and drink, got for the most part very drunk, and were then driven back by General Johnson, leaving twenty-six hundred of their number behind them in killed, wounded, and dead drunk. At the news of this success of the king's troops at New Ross, a body of the insurgents stationed at Scullabogue massacred in cold blood more than one hundred Protestants they had taken prisoners.

These and similar atrocities prevented the Presbyterians of the north from rising, and gave to the insurrection the old character of a popish rebellion and massacre. But the best of the Roman Catholics presently came forward to express their abhorrence of the whole rising, and to offer their assistance to the government in suppressing it. After a few other fights or skirmishes, General Lake attacked, on the 21st of June, the fortified position at Vinegar Hill, carried it with a frightful loss to the insurgents, who never rallied again, and then retook Wexford and Enniscorthy.

Lord Camden was now recalled from the lieutenancy of Ireland, and succeeded by Lord Cornwallis, who brought with him a general pardon (with a very few exceptions) to all who submitted. Of the leading conspirators who had been taken, only four—M'Cann, Byrn, and two brothers of the name of Sheares, the sons of a banker at Cork—were executed. Bond was condemned to die; but his life was spared on condition of disclosing all he knew respecting the rebellion—a condition he accepted, with the proviso that his information should not affect the lives of his fellow-prisoners. Arthur O'Connor, M'Neven, Emmet, Sampson, and the rest were merely banished. In the month of August, when the flames of rebellion seemed completely extinguished, three French frigates, eluding the vigilance of the fleets, reached Killala, and threw on shore nine hundred troops of the line, commanded by General Humbert. A small number of the Roman Catholic peasantry of the country joined him, and Humbert proceeded rapidly to Castlebar. There he encountered General Lake, with a force superior in number, but consisting chiefly of Protestant yeomanry and militia. Lake was beaten, and in his retreat lost six guns.

From Castlebar, Humbert marched eastward into the very heart of the country, expecting to be joined by all the men of Connaught, if not by all the papists of the island, but finding, wherever he advanced, that the mass of the people shunned him and his soldiers as though they had brought the plague with them. About seventeen days after his first landing, Humbert was beaten by the advance guard of Lord Cornwallis, who was marching against him; and on the 8th of September, being entirely surrounded, the French laid down their arms and became prisoners of war.

To keep up the ferment and suspicion, and to oblige England to maintain a large force in Ireland, the French, within a month after the surrender of Humbert, ordered a squadron of one ship of the line and eight frigates, with troops, arms, and ammunition on board, to choose a favourable moment for getting to sea, and then to proceed to Ireland at all hazards. This armament actually reached the western coast of Ireland; but Sir John Borlase Warren, with his squadron, met it there, and gave a very good account of it, capturing the ship of the line and three of the frigates. On board the French ship of the line was seized Wolfe Tone, whose deeds, words, and writings had placed

[1798-1800 A.D.]

him beyond the liberally extended verge of mercy. On his trial,¹ he pleaded his commission of a brigadier-general in the French army as a bar to punishment for all treasons, present or past; but he was condemned to die the death of a traitor; and finding that the sentence really meant hanging, he cut his throat in Dublin jail to escape the ignominy of the gallows.^k

THE UNION (1801 A.D.)

William Pitt, the great English prime minister, had long resolved upon a legislative union between England and Ireland: he believed the proper time had now come, and made very careful preparations for his purpose. At the opening of 1799 the marquis of Cornwallis was lord lieutenant and Lord Castlereagh was chief secretary. The union was indirectly referred to in the Irish parliament in the speech from the throne on the 22nd of January, 1799. The opposition at once took the matter up, and they were joined by many who had hitherto been supporters of the government, among others John Foster the speaker, Sir John Parnell the chancellor of the exchequer, prime serjeant Fitzgerald, and Sir Jonah Barrington: all fearing the loss of their parliament. They moved "that the undoubted birthright of the people of Ireland, a resident and independent legislature, should be maintained." After an excited debate of twenty-two hours the votes were equally divided, one hundred and six on each side. Parnell and Fitzgerald were soon afterwards dismissed from their offices.

In February, 1799, the scheme was brought forward in the English parliament by Pitt, and approved. In Ireland elaborate preparations were made to carry it in next session. All persons holding offices who showed themselves adverse were dismissed. The Irish government had been all along corrupt—but now, still under outside orders, it went far beyond anything ever experienced before.

Those who had the disposal of seats—a money-making possession in times of election—were in great alarm; for if the union were carried the three hundred members would have to be reduced to a third, so that about two hundred constituencies would be disfranchised. The opposition of these proprietors was bought off by large sums: about £15,000 was paid for each seat. One proprietor got £52,000; two others £45,000 each; a third £23,000; and so on. The entire sum paid for the whole of the "rotten" or "pocket" boroughs as they were called, was £1,260,000, which Ireland itself had to pay, for it was added to the Irish national debt.

To purchase the votes of individual members, and the favour of certain influential outsiders, twenty-eight new peers were created, and twenty-two of those already peers were promoted; and there were besides great numbers of bribes in the shape of pensions, judgeships, baronetcies, preferments, various situations, and direct cash. All this was done with scarcely an attempt at concealment. Lord Cornwallis, a high-minded man, expressed the utmost abhorrence at being obliged to take a part in these transactions.

The session opened on the 15th of January, 1800, the last meeting of the Irish parliament. Grattan, knowing what was coming, had himself elected member for Wicklow, and though very ill, he rose from his bed and took his seat dressed in the uniform of the volunteers. Dublin was in a state of fearful excitement. The streets were filled with dismayed and sorrow-stricken

[¹ Tone was defended by the eloquent John Philpot Curran, who in a masterful speech succeeded in obtaining a stay of execution on legal grounds. But in the mean time Tone died from his self-inflicted wound.]

crowds who had to be kept within bounds by cavalry. Lord Castlereagh brought forward the motion in the commons. The anti-unionists opposed the project most determinedly; Grattan, worn with sickness, pleaded with all his old fiery eloquence; and Sir John Parnell proposed that there should be a dissolution and that a new parliament should be called to determine this great question; but the unionists carried everything. There were many motions: on the first the government had one hundred and fifty-eight against one hundred and fifteen, and in the others there were corresponding majorities.

In the lords the bill was introduced by Lord Clare (John Fitzgibbon), who had fifty votes against twenty-five. On the 1st of August the royal assent was given; and the act of union came into force on the 1st of January, 1801.

The following are the chief provisions of the act of union:

(1) The two kingdoms to be henceforward one—"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland"; the succession to the throne to remain the same as before.

(2) The Irish representation in the united parliament to be—In the lords: four spiritual peers taken in rotation, from session to session, from the Irish Protestant hierarchy; and twenty-eight temporal peers to be elected for life by the whole Irish peerage; in the commons: one hundred members.

(3) All subjects of the United Kingdom to be under the same regulations as to trade and commerce.

(4) The Irish established church to be continued forever, and to be united with that of England.

(5) All members of parliament to take an oath, framed to exclude Roman Catholics (for no Catholic could conscientiously take it).

(6) Ireland to contribute two-seventeenths to the expenditure of the United Kingdom for twenty years, when new arrangements would be made.

(7) Each of the two countries to retain its own national debt as then existing; but all future debts contracted to be joint debts.

(8) The courts of justice to remain as they were: final appeals to the house of lords.

Pitt had at first intended to include in the articles of union the emancipation of the Catholics; but to this the leading Irish Protestants gave such fierce opposition that he had to abandon it.

But in order to lessen the hostility of the Catholics to the union, a promise was conveyed to them that emancipation would immediately follow. The promise, however, was not carried out; and the measure was delayed for twenty-nine years, chiefly through the invincible obstinacy of George III, who had a fixed idea that to agree to such a measure would be a breach of his coronation oath.

ROBERT EMMET'S INSURRECTION (1802-1803 A.D.)

In 1802 Robert Emmet, a gifted, earnest, noble-minded young man of twenty-four, younger brother of Thomas Addis Emmet, attempted to re-organise the United Irishmen. He had just returned from France and had hopes of aid from Napoleon. He employed all his private fortune in the secret manufacture of pikes and other arms. His plan was to attack Dublin castle and Pigeon House fort; and he had intended to rise in August, 1803, by which time he expected invasion from France; but an accidental explosion in one of his depots precipitated his plans. The 23rd of July was now fixed; on which day he expected a contingent from the celebrated Wicklow rebel, Michael Dwyer; and another from Kildare.

[1803-1805 A.D.]

By some misunderstanding the Wicklow men did not arrive; and though the Kildare men came, there was no one to direct them. Towards evening a report was brought that the military were approaching; whereupon, in desperation, he sallied from his depot in Marshalsea lane into Thomas street and towards the castle, with about one hundred men.

The city was soon in an uproar; the mob rose up, and some stragglers, bent on mischief and beyond all restraint, began outrages. Meeting the chief justice, Lord Kilwarden, a good man and a humane judge, they dragged him from his coach and murdered him. When news of this outrage and others was brought to Emmet he was filled with horror, and attempted, but in vain, to quell the mob. Seeing that the attempt on the castle was hopeless, he fled to Rathfarnham.

He might have escaped, but he insisted on remaining to take leave of Sarah Curran, daughter of John Philpot Curran, to whom he was secretly engaged. He was arrested by Major Sirr on the 25th of August at his hiding-place in Harold's Cross; and soon after was tried and convicted, making a short speech of great power in the dock. On the next day, the 20th of September, 1803, he was hanged in Thomas street.^d

DANIEL O'CONNELL AND CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

After the union the Irish waited in vain for the promised act of emancipation, but King George remained as obstinate as ever. In 1805 Grattan became a member of parliament, and threw himself with all his power into the cause of Irish Catholic emancipation. A proposal to couple emancipation with a royal veto on the appointment of Irish Catholic bishops was rejected by the Irish generally, led by Daniel O'Connell, though favoured by most of the Irish gentry. The rejection of the project offered the opportunity to O'Connell to step into the position of a popular leader, an opportunity of which he, shrewdly, was not slow to take advantage.^a

To understand O'Connell's greatness we must look to the field of Irish politics. From early manhood he had turned his mind to the condition of Ireland and the mass of her people. The worst severities of the penal code had been, in a certain measure, relaxed; but the Catholics were still in a state of vassalage, and they were still pariahs compared with the Protestants. The rebellion of 1798 and the union had dashed the hopes of the Catholic leaders, and their prospects of success seemed very remote when, in the first years of the last century, this still unknown lawyer took up their cause. Up to this juncture the question had been in the hands of Grattan and other Protestants, and of a small knot of Catholic nobles and prelates; but their efforts had not accomplished much.

O'Connell inaugurated a different policy, and had soon given the Catholic



DANIEL O'CONNELL
(1775-1847)

[1823-1836 A.D.]

movement an energy it had not before possessed. Himself a Catholic of birth and genius, unfairly kept back in the race of life, he devoted his heart and soul to the cause, and his character and antecedents made him the champion who ultimately assured its triumph. Having no sympathy with the rule of "the Saxon," he saw clearly how weak was the hold of the government and the Protestant caste on the vast mass of the Catholic nation; having a firm faith in the influence of his church, he perceived that it might be made an instrument of immense political power in Ireland; and, having attained a mastery over the lawyer's craft, he knew how a great popular movement might be so conducted as to elude the law and yet be in the highest degree formidable.

With these convictions he formed the bold design of combining the Irish Catholic millions under the superintendence of the native priesthood into a vast league against the existing order of things, and of wresting the concession of the Catholic claims from every opposing party in the state by an agitation, continually kept up, and embracing almost the whole of the people, but maintained within constitutional limits, though menacing and shaking the frame of society. He gradually succeeded in carrying out his purpose: Catholic associations, at first small, but slowly assuming larger proportions, were formed in different parts of the country; attempts of the government and of the local authorities to put them down were skilfully baffled by legal devices of many kinds; and at last, after a conflict of years, all Catholic Ireland was arrayed to a man in an organisation of enormous power that demanded its rights with no uncertain voice.

O'Connell, having long before attained an undisputed and easy ascendancy, stood at the head of this great national movement; but it will be observed that, having been controlled from first to last by himself and the priesthood, it had little in common with the mob rule and violence which he had never ceased to regard with aversion. His election to parliament for Clare in 1828 proved the forerunner of the inevitable change, and the Catholic claims were granted the next year to the intense regret of the Protestant Irish, by a government avowedly hostile to the last, but unable to withstand the overwhelming pressure of a people united to insist on justice. The result, unquestionably, was almost wholly due to the energy and genius of a single man, though the Catholic question would have been settled, in all probability, in the course of time; and it must be added that O'Connell's triumph, which showed what agitation could effect in Ireland, was far from doing his country unmixed good.

O'CONNELL'S LATER CAREER

O'Connell joined the whigs on entering parliament, and gave effective aid to the cause of reform. The agitation, however, on the Catholic question had quickened the sense of the wrongs of Ireland, and the Irish Catholics were engaged ere long in a crusade against tithes and the established church, the most offensive symbols of their inferiority in the state. It may be questioned whether O'Connell was not rather led than a leader in this; the movement, at least, passed beyond his control, and the country for many months was terrorised by scenes of appalling crime and bloodshed. Lord Grey, very properly, proposed measures of repression to put this anarchy down, and O'Connell opposed them with extreme vehemence, a seeming departure from his avowed principles, but natural in the case of a proper tribune. This caused a breach between him and the whigs; but he gradually returned to his alle-

[1838-1844 A.D.]

giance to them when they practically abolished Irish tithes, cut down the revenues of the established church, and endeavoured to secularise the surplus.

By this time O'Connell had attained a position of great eminence in the house of commons: as a debater he stood in the very first rank, though he had entered St. Stephen's after fifty; and his oratory, massive and strong in argument, although often scurrilous and coarse, and marred by a bearing in which cringing flattery and rude bullying were strangely blended, made a powerful, if not a pleasing, impression. O'Connell steadily supported Lord Melbourne's government in its policy of advancing Irish Catholics to places of trust and power in the state, though personally he refused a high judicial office. Though a strict adherent of the creed of Rome, he was a liberal, nay a radical, as regards measures for the vindication of human liberty. His conservatism was most apparent in his antipathy to socialistic doctrines and his tenacious regard for the claims of property. He actually opposed the Irish Poor Law, as encouraging a communistic spirit; he declared a movement against rent a crime; and, though he had a strong sympathy with the Irish peasant, and advocated a reform of his precarious tenure, it is difficult to imagine that he could have approved the cardinal principle of the Irish Land Act, the judicial adjustment of rent by the state.

O'Connell changed his policy as regards Ireland when Peel became minister in 1841. He declared that a tory *régime* in his country was incompatible with good government, and he began an agitation for the repeal of the union. One of his motives in taking this course, no doubt, was a strong personal dislike of Peel, with whom he had often been in collision, and who had singled him out in 1829 for what must be called a marked affront. O'Connell, nevertheless, was sincere and even consistent in his conduct: he had denounced the union in early manhood as an obstacle to the Catholic cause; he had spoken against the measure in parliament; he believed that the claims of Ireland were set aside or slighted in what he deemed an alien assembly; and, though he had ceased for some years to demand repeal, and regarded it as rather a means than an end, he was throughout life an avowed repealer. It should be observed, however, that in his judgment the repeal of the union would not weaken the real bond between Great Britain and Ireland; and he had nothing in common with the rebellious faction who, at a later period, openly declared for the separation of the two countries by force.

The organisation (the Catholic Association) which had effected such marvellous results in 1828-1829 was recreated for the new project. Enormous meetings, convened by the priesthood and directed or controlled by O'Connell, assembled in 1842-1843, and probably nine-tenths of the Irish Catholics were unanimous in the cry for repeal. O'Connell seems to have thought success certain; but he had not perceived the essential difference between his earlier agitation and this. The enlightened opinion of the three kingdoms for the most part approved the Catholic claims, and as certainly it condemned repeal. After some hesitation Peel resolved to put down the repeal movement. A vast intended meeting was proclaimed unlawful, and O'Connell was arrested and held to bail with ten or twelve of his principal followers. He was convicted after the trials that followed, but they were not good specimens of equal justice, and the sentence was reversed by the house of lords, with the approbation of competent judges.

The spell, however, of O'Connell's power had vanished; his health had suffered much from a short confinement; he was verging upon his seventieth year, and he was alarmed and pained by the growth of a party in the repeal ranks who scoffed at his views and advocated the revolutionary doctrines

[1845-1867 A.D.]

which he had always feared and abhorred. Before long famine had fallen on the land, and under this visitation the repeal movement, already paralysed, wholly collapsed. O'Connell died soon afterwards, on the 15th of May, 1847, at Genoa, whilst on his way to Rome, profoundly afflicted by his country's misery, and by the failure of his late high hopes, yet soothed in dying by sincere sympathy, felt throughout Ireland and largely in Europe, and expressed even by political foes. He was a remarkable man in every sense of the word; Catholic Ireland calls him her "liberator" still; and history will say of him that, with some failings, he had many and great gifts, that he was an orator of a high order, and that, agitator as he was, he possessed the wisdom, the caution, and the tact of a real statesman.⁹

The national system of education introduced in 1833 was the real recantation of intolerant opinions, but the economic state of Ireland was fearful. The famine, emigration, and the new Poor Law had nearly got rid of starvation, but the people had not become frankly loyal, for they felt that they owed more to their own importunity, to their own misfortunes, than to the wisdom of their rulers. The efforts of young Ireland eventuated in another rebellion (1848); a revolutionary wave could not roll over Europe without touching the unlucky island. After the failure of that wretched outbreak there was peace until the close of the American Civil War released a number of adventurers trained to the use of arms and filled with hatred to England.

FENIANISM

Already in 1858 the discovery of the Phoenix conspiracy had shown that the policy of Mitchel and his associates was not forgotten. John O'Mahony, one of the men of '48, organised a formidable secret society in America, which his historical studies led him to call the Fenian brotherhood. The money raised in the United States was perhaps not less than £80,000, but it is due to O'Mahony to say that he died poor. In Ireland the chief direction of the conspiracy was assumed by James Stephens, who had been implicated in the Phoenix affair, and who never cordially agreed with O'Mahony. Stephens was very despotic—a true revolutionary leader. As in all Irish political conspiracies there were traitors in the camp, who kept the authorities well informed, and in September, 1865, the *Irish People* newspaper, which had been the organ of the movement, was suddenly suppressed by the government. The arrests of Luby, O'Leary, and O'Donovan Rossa followed, all of whom, with many others, were afterwards prosecuted to conviction. Stephens for a time eluded the police, living with little concealment in a villa near Dublin, and apparently occupied in gardening. But in November he was identified and captured, much evidence being found in his house. Ten days afterwards he escaped from Richmond prison, and it is now known that some of the warders were Fenians.

The promptitude of the government perhaps prevented a general insurrection, but there was a partial outbreak in February and March, 1867, chiefly in Kerry, Limerick, and Tipperary. The police, who behaved extremely well, were often attacked, but the Fenians abstained from plunder or from any acts which might estrange the rural population. The peasants, however, though for the most part nationalists, did not care to risk their lives in such a wild enterprise, and the young men of the towns furnished the only real force. Weather of extraordinary severity, which will long be remembered as the "Fenian winter," completed their discomfiture, and they suffered fearful hardships. There was enough sympathy with the movement to procure

[1867-1881 A.D.]

the election of O'Donovan Rossa for Tipperary in 1867, when he was actually undergoing penal servitude. John Mitchel, whose old sentence was unreversed, was chosen by the same constituency as late as 1875, but in neither case was the vote a large one. It became the fashion in Ireland to celebrate annually the obsequies of the "Manchester martyrs," as the three Fenians were called who suffered death for the murder of Police-sergeant Brett. The Roman Catholic church has always opposed secret societies, and some priests had the firmness to discountenance these political funerals, but strong popular excitement in Ireland has generally been beyond clerical control. Even as late as 1879 the Fenian spirit was not extinct, and one of the brotherhood, named Devoy, announced a new departure in January of that year.

The Fenian movement disclosed much discontent, and was attended by criminal outrages in England. The abolition of the Irish church establishment, which had long been condemned by public opinion, was then decreed (1869). The land question was next taken in hand (1870). These reforms did not, however, put an end to Irish agitation. The Home Rule party, which demanded the restoration of a separate Irish parliament, showed increased activity, and the general election of 1874 gave it a strong representation at Westminster, where one section of the party developed into the "Obstructionists." Bad seasons and distress among the peasantry (1878-1880) added force to the Land League, and agrarian outrages increased to an alarming extent on the expiration of the Peace Preservation Act and the rejection by the lords of a bill temporarily limiting evictions. In 1881 a Coercion act was passed, and was immediately followed by a new Land act of large scope.

H. W.—VOL. XXI, 2 G



BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS

[The letter ^a is reserved for Editorial Matter.]

CHAPTER I. EARLY HISTORY AND THE ANGLO-NORMAN CONQUEST

^b W. K. SULLIVAN, article on "Ireland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^c J. A. FROUDE, *The English in Ireland*.—^d W. BASIL JONES, *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd*.—^e BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History*.—^f A. G. RICHEY, *Short History of the Irish People*.—^g J. H. BURTON, *History of Scotland*.—^h ANNALS OF THE FOUR MASTERS.—ⁱ WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De Gestis Rerum Anglorum*.—^j GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, *Topographia Hibernia*.—^k C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^l J. H. RAMSAY, *The Foundations of England*.—^m JOCELIN, *Life of St. Patrick*.—ⁿ WAR OF THE GÆDHIL WITH THE GAILL.—^o J. J. A. WORSAAE, *Account of the Danes and Norwegians in England, Scotland and Ireland*.

CHAPTER II. IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE

^p R. BAGWELL, article on "Ireland" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^q J. LINGARD, *History of England*.—^r P. W. JOYCE, *Concise History of Ireland*.—^s J. FROISSART, *Chronicles*.—^t A. G. RICHEY, *History of the Irish People*.—^u ANNALS OF THE FOUR MASTERS.—^v R. BAGWELL, *Ireland Under the Tudors*.—^w HARLEIAN MISCELLANY.—^x E. SPENSER, *View of the State of Ireland*.—^y C. MACFARLANE AND T. THOMSON, *Comprehensive History of England*.—^z STATE PAPERS OF HENRY THE VIII, *The State of Ireland and the Plans for its Reformation*.—^{aa} C. KNIGHT, *History of England*.—^{ab} NARRATIVES OF THE CONTESTS IN IRELAND (Camden Soc. Pub.).—^{ac} EARL OF CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion*.—^{ad} GOLDWIN SMITH, *Irish History and Irish Character*.—^{ae} W. O'CONNOR MORRIS, article on "Daniel O'Connell" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—^{af} ROBERT REDMAN, *Vita Henrici V*.—^{ag} LIBELL OF ENGLISH POLICE.—^{ah} T. KEIGHTLEY, *History of England*.—^{ai} T. CARLYLE, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*.—^{aj} T. B. MACAULAY, *History of England*.—^{ak} MATTHEW PARIS, *Chronica*.—^{al} JOHN DAVIES, *A Discourse Why Ireland Has Never Been Entirely Subdued*.



BOOK IV

ENGLAND SINCE 1792

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLAND FROM 1792 TO 1815

WRITTEN SPECIALLY FOR THE PRESENT WORK BY

C. W. C. OMAN, F.S.A.

IN the twenty-three years which elapsed between the armed intervention of Pitt in the wars of the French Revolution and the final victory of Waterloo modern England was created. In making this statement we do not refer to the mere growth of the British Empire. The actual territorial gains from France and her allies were comparatively insignificant. It was not by acquiring Ceylon or Trinidad, Demerara or Mauritius, the naval station at the Cape of Good Hope, or the fortress of Malta that Britain grew great. It was rather by the hardening process of struggling through an almost continuous war of more than twenty years, during which the odds were generally against her, and her national existence was for long periods in imminent danger, that she developed into her new consciousness of her power and her mission. In all history there is no better example of the reward that awaits the nation that endures to the end, and refuses with an enlightened obstinacy to accept any peace destitute of the real elements of solidity and security. The long years of war were, it is true, interrupted by one short truce—it was not a real pacification—during the thirteen months which followed the Treaty of Amiens [March, 1802–May, 1803], but Great Britain wisely recommenced hostilities the moment that she had discovered that she had to do with an adversary whose aims and ambitions were incompatible with her own. Having discovered what Bonaparte was, and what he wanted, the British ministers saw that the struggle with him must be urged to the bitter end. They were right, and their country owed them for their clear-sightedness a debt of gratitude which has never been sufficiently acknowledged. Pitt, Castlereagh, and Canning made the England of the nineteenth century: if their policy had been

reversed, and the enemy had been allowed leisure to consolidate his naval power, a disaster would have been more than probable. To what depths of humiliation the policy of peace at any price might have led no man can tell—perhaps a consistent attempt to preserve neutrality might have conducted Great Britain to the same misery to which it led Prussia in 1806-1807.

THE UNPREPAREDNESS OF BRITAIN

At the commencement of the revolutionary war Great Britain was entirely unprepared for any effective armed intervention on the Continent. William Pitt had been essentially a peace minister: he had been pursuing for the first eight years of his premiership a policy of financial and administrative reform, with the object of enabling the nation to recover from the exhaustion in which it had been left at the end of the war of American independence. Never had he been so confident that he might pursue his course without being distracted by dangerous foreign complications as he was in 1792. In the February of that year he asserted in a speech that: "Unquestionably there never was a time in the history of this country when from the situation of Europe we may more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than we may at the present moment." In consequence he cut down the establishment of the navy to sixteen thousand seamen and marines in his last peace budget, and reduced the number of the troops maintained in Great Britain to about the same amount. These are sufficient signs that the British government neither expected nor wished to be dragged into a new continental war. The opening act of the French Revolution had aroused sympathy in some observers on this side of the channel, and repulsion in others; but the latter were as far as the former from any desire to intervene in the internal affairs of France. They looked on the domestic troubles of the neighbouring realm as likely to disable it from active interference in European politics for many a year and rejoiced at the prospect.

It was not till the "September Massacres" and the deposition of Louis XVI that English public opinion began to spy real danger in the mad progress of the French republicans. From that moment men began to doubt whether our neighbours' concerns would not begin to affect us too closely to permit of the continuance of neutrality. The great whig orator, Edmund Burke, had long been thundering to unheeding ears about the peril to Great Britain, no less than to the rest of Europe, involved in the rise of an anarchic revolutionary propaganda in France. Hitherto most men had been content to believe that such a movement might be dangerous to effete continental despotism, but that it would not affect an orderly constitutional monarchy like Great Britain. In the autumn of 1792 they began to feel doubts upon this point, and to think that there was much truth in Burke's long series of pamphlets and speeches which kept reiterating the theme that the Revolution was the natural enemy of constitutional liberty no less than of bureaucratic autocracy.

The technical point upon which friction with France first began was our connection with Holland. Many treaties, of which the last had been signed as late as 1788, bound us to protect the United Provinces, and to support them on the question of the navigation of the Scheldt, which for the last two centuries had been the most important item in Dutch foreign policy. Now, after overrunning Belgium, the French republican armies showed strong signs of being about to interfere in Holland. The ministers at Paris had declared that the opening of the Scheldt was an "inevitable law of nature"; French troops had trespassed on Dutch territory, and had even demanded a free

[1792-1793 A.D.]

passage through the Dutch fortress of Maestricht. Secret agents had been intercepted bearing communications between French officials and domestic malcontents in Holland. If the Dutch were attacked, England would be bound by treaty to intervene in their favour. With this indisputable fact in view Pitt on December 1st, 1792, called out the militia, and gave orders that many warships should be put in commission. The navy had been reduced to such a small establishment, that even in face of the mere chance of war it was impracticably weak.

But it was not really the danger of a French invasion of Holland that weighed most with the cabinet and the nation during the winter months of 1792-1793. There was a general feeling that (even if the Dutch question had not existed) the French republic was a neighbour of insufferably dangerous and aggressive tendencies. If this view became more and more prevalent the French had themselves to blame. They were flinging firebrands all over Europe in the form of appeals to the nations bidding them rise against their rulers. On November 19th the national convention had passed a decree proffering French assistance to "all subjects revolting against a tyrant." That this decree threatened Great Britain no less than other neutral powers was shown clearly enough. There existed on this side of the channel a certain number of clubs and associations founded during the last two or three years to manifest sympathy with the Revolution. The addresses and deputations which these bodies were continually sending to Paris were formally acknowledged by the convention in language which it was wholly improper to use to the citizens of another state. A single example may suffice. On November 21st some deputies from British associations came before the bar of the convention, announcing their intention of establishing a similar convention in their own country, and expressing their hopes that France "would never lay down her arms as long as tyrants and slaves continue to exist." The astounding reply of the president of the convention was that "royalty in Europe is either destroyed, or on the point of perishing in the ruins of feudalism. The declaration of the rights of man is a devouring fire which consumes all thrones. Worthy republicans, the festivals which you celebrate in honour of the French Revolution are the prelude to the festival of nations," etc., etc. Such language was a direct incitement from the governing body of France to the discontented British subjects, inviting them to overthrow their own constitution. The same impression was produced by the conduct of the French to the celebrated atheist pamphleteer, Tom Paine: prosecuted for seditious libel in England he fled to Paris, where he was at once made a French citizen and elected as a member of the convention.

The English revolutionary societies had little hold upon the country, but they made up for their want of power and numbers by the violence of their language. The leaders were political visionaries steeped in the theories of Rousseau, or men with a grievance, or ambitious nobodies who loved to hear themselves talk. The dangerous section of their followers was drawn from that discontented class which exists in all states whether kingdoms or republics. Such men, twenty years before, had led the Gordon riots, and twenty-five years later were to join the Cato street conspiracy. They were of the same type which to-day supplies the anarchists of Chicago or the nihilists of St. Petersburg. But the bulk of the audiences to which the English revolutionary orators ranted were merely composed of the ordinary victims of hard times. The year 1792 had seen a bad harvest and high prices, there was much distress and some rioting which (guided by the local Jacobins) often took a republican aspect. The whole movement deserved contempt rather

than fear—a few local bread-riots and some incendiary harangues delivered by mischievous idiots could not seriously threaten the British constitution. But they seemed serious enough when studied in comparison with the original disturbances which had heralded the revolution in France. Forgetting that the circumstances in the two countries were wholly different, and that on this side of the channel the government was supported by a clear majority of all classes, the leading men of England took the revolutionary agitation very seriously. It was not only the cabinet and the tory party which were moved: by much the larger half of the whigs were inspired by the same feeling. When their leader, Fox, opposed a warlike address to the crown in the house of commons, only fifty of his party voted with him; the rest followed Pitt. Indeed, between 1792 and 1795 the whole right wing of the whig party moved over one by one to the other side of the house: many of them actually adhered to the tory government and ultimately accepted office under it. Fox remained with a mere handful of followers to represent the old opposition, and was looked on with suspicion by the larger part of the nation, as one who for factious party reasons refused to support a necessary and inevitable national war.

OUTBREAK OF WAR (1793 A.D.)

Meanwhile the war had come. While angry notes and accusations of mutual hostility were passing between the English and French governments, the convention, in which the violent Jacobin party had seized on complete ascendancy, tried and executed King Louis XVI. They sent the feeble and irresolute monarch to the guillotine as a direct challenge to monarchical Europe: "the coalised kings threatened us," said Danton, "and we hurl at their feet as our gage the head of a king." On January 21st, 1793, the unhappy Louis went to the guillotine. No event abroad since the massacre of St. Bartholomew had created such a universal movement of horror in England. On the 24th Pitt bade the French ambassador quit the country: on February 1st the convention replied by declaring war on England, and followed this act up by a similar declaration against the Dutch.

Thus commenced the first act of the great war with France. It was to last more than nine years (February 1st, 1793–March 25th, 1802). From the English point of view it was purely a war of opinion: there was no question of naval supremacy or commerce or transmarine empire involved, as there had been in all our previous contests with France during the eighteenth century. Great Britain took arms to defend herself from the insolent Jacobin propaganda which was openly threatening her, and to protect her constitution. Pitt hoped that the struggle would be short. When the English fleet came to the help of the armies of the continental powers, he judged that France must soon succumb. Like every other statesman in Europe he could not foresee that the frantic energy of the Jacobins would triumph over the loose league of monarchs whose interests were divergent and whose seal was of very various quality.

The history of the revolutionary war from the English point of view falls into three periods. The first embraces the struggle against the Jacobins, in 1793–1794; the second that against the directory, from 1794–1799; the third that with the first consul Bonaparte, from 1799 to 1802. Each of these sections has its peculiar characteristics. During the first, Great Britain was but one of the assailants, who were beating upon every frontier of the French Republic. Her part in the war was but secondary. Things became very

[1793-1797 A.D.]

different in 1795, when all the other European powers save Austria and Sardinia withdrew from the strife; the stress became heavier, and when Sardinia had been crushed and Austria forced to sign the Peace of Campo Formio (October, 1797), Great Britain was left for a space as the sole antagonist of France. This year and that which followed were the most dangerous periods of the struggle; we shall see that for a time the prospect looked gloomy, and that when internal sedition came to the aid of the foreign enemy it seemed for one black year that Britain was doomed. But the greed of the directory rekindled the European war in 1798, and once more Pitt found continental allies to distract the attention of the foe. It was not till after Marengo and the Peace of Lunéville (February, 1801) that Britain was once more left alone to face France under her new dictator, the first consul Bonaparte. For thirteen months she strove against him with good success, but gladly came to terms in March, 1802, at the Peace of Amiens, when it was thought that the revolutionary storm had blown over, and that a definitive pacification might at last be arrived at with our neighbours.

THE FIRST STAGES OF THE WAR

In the first stage of the war, from 1793 to the Peace of Bâle, it must be confessed that Great Britain did not figure to advantage. It is true that her fleet was soon raised to a footing which enabled it to sweep the seas, and that after Howe's victory of the "Glorious First of June," 1794, the disorganised navy of the Jacobins had to hide itself in the recesses of its harbours. It was a great advantage to command the seas, and to know that our commerce and our colonies were safe. But in all else the efforts of Britain were misdirected and ineffectual. Attempts to aid French malcontents by co-operating with the Vendéans in the west, and the insurgents of Toulon in the south ended in humiliation to ourselves and in the destruction of our unfortunate allies. Still worse was the effect of the duke of York's expedition to Flanders (1793-1794) to assist the Austrians in their attack on northern France. The army was not in a condition to co-operate with advantage in a great continental campaign. The land forces of Britain had been hastily increased from about forty thousand men to one hundred thousand in 1793, but organisation was wanting, and the leaders were hopelessly incompetent. The men fought well enough, but the generals could not utilise their courage, and the dilatory and incapable prince who had been placed in command was beaten out of Flanders, chased across Holland, and compelled to seek refuge in Germany after an almost unbroken series of disasters. The prestige of the British army never sank lower than in 1794, and a widespread opinion began to prevail that it was useless to hope to face the French on land.

The first stage of the war ended in disappointment; the struggle had proved long and arduous, and was clearly far from its end. But worse was to come. The Jacobin government having fallen in France (July, 1794), several of the states which had formed the monarchical league against the revolution made peace with the more moderate (if also more corrupt) directory which succeeded it. After the treaties of Bâle (June-July, 1795) Austria and Sardinia were the only effective allies who remained to us, and they were not destined to abide for long in the coalition. The commanding personality of Napoleon Bonaparte had appeared upon the scene: in his great Italian campaign of 1796-1797 he shattered Sardinia, expelled the Austrians from Lombardy, and forced them back into their own territories, where, after

having carried the terror of his arms almost to the gates of Vienna, he dictated the Peace of Campo Formio.

Left alone in Europe Great Britain had now to reconsider her position. She was no longer one of a confederacy assailing France, but was herself assailed by a confederacy headed by France. For Holland had now become a client state to her conqueror, and Spain had been led by ancient commercial jealousy to unite with the directory in an attempt to strike down the naval predominance of Britain. The fleets of both these important maritime powers were placed at the disposition of our enemies, while the victorious French armies from Italy and Germany were brought across to the shores of the English Channel to watch for an opportunity of invasion.

The situation would have been threatening even if Great Britain had been unhampered by domestic troubles. But in 1797-1798 her internal situation was deplorable. The moral effect of unsuccessful war is always demoralising; the enormous amount of fresh taxation that had been imposed, the growing weight of the national debt, a series of bad harvests, commercial distress caused by the closing of a great part of the Continent to English trade, had all contributed to breed misery. There was also no inconsiderable amount of political discontent: the terror inspired by the Jacobin propaganda had caused Pitt to abandon his old liberal principles of government, and to introduce much legislation which seemed to trespass on the old national liberties. The right of free meeting had been limited, arbitrary imprisonment had become possible by the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, free speech and the liberty of the press had been restricted. Harsh and vindictive sentences had been passed on many persons accused of seditious intentions. The natural consequence had been to create a much more serious feeling of unrest than had prevailed at the commencement of the war.

THE CONDITION OF IRELAND

But if Great Britain's political condition was unsatisfactory, that of Ireland was absolutely deplorable. There all the conditions suitable for the development of domestic trouble were already in existence before the revolutionary war broke out, and the torch only needed to be applied to the inflammable material. In 1782 Ireland had obtained a home-rule parliament, but therewith only the mockery of self-government. All power was in the hands of a minority, the members of the established church of Ireland, who alone were eligible for seats in the legislature. Not only Roman Catholics but even Protestant dissenters were excluded from it, and the former were still denied many of the common political rights of citizens. It was only in 1792 that they had been granted freedom of public worship and the right to vote for members of parliament, though they could sit themselves. The Romanists formed five-sevenths of the whole population of the island, yet had to submit to the arbitrary governance of the minority. Here, if anywhere in Europe, was a people to whom the appeal of the Jacobins might most appropriately be addressed. Yet the first converts of the French propaganda were not Romanists, but members of the much less numerous class of Protestant malcontents, some of them political dissenters, others zealots inspired by the common enthusiasm for the ideas of the Revolution which had penetrated to every corner of Europe. For some time the Romanists held back—the priesthood had been frightened by the wild words of the atheists and freethinkers of the French convention, and doubted whether support ought to be sought in such quarters. But in spite of their reluctance many Catho-

[1797 A.D.]

lics soon pressed into the ranks of the discontented; their political grievances outweighed their religious scruples.

From this movement arose the celebrated revolutionary society of the "United Irishmen," whose chiefs agreed to set religion aside, and to work for the union of the radical dissenters of Ulster and the Romanists of the south. It was a strange league when the local Jacobins undertook to direct the ignorant and bigoted peasantry into the paths of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." From 1793-1796 the way was being prepared for a common rising, and every region of Ireland was honeycombed with secret societies, who bound themselves to rise when the signal should be given. All the prominent leaders, it should be noted, were nominal Protestants: Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Wolfe Tone, Napper Tandy, Oliver Bond, and the rest were enthusiastic republicans, not oppressed Catholics. But the whole strength of the movement lay in the other wing—the main body of the Irish Protestants adhered to the government which gave them such an unnatural predominance in the realm. It was only in certain Presbyterian districts of Ulster that the non-Catholic section of the United Irishmen were numerous. The real power of the conspiracy lay in the number of the Catholic rank and file who had placed themselves at the disposition of the Jacobins.

As long as France alone was at war with Great Britain the Irish plotters saw that they could not count on any useful foreign help. But the adherence of Holland and Spain to the French alliance changed the whole aspect of affairs. Instead of having Brest and Toulon alone to watch, the English fleet had now to guard the Texel, Ferrol, Cadiz, and Carthage. For the proper blockade of the whole of the coast of Europe from the north point of Holland to the eastern cape of Spain our naval forces were inadequate. Moreover, a concentration of the Spanish and Dutch Atlantic fleets with the Brest squadron would produce a numerical force of ships far greater than Britain could oppose to it.

Here lay the danger in 1797—if the Cadiz fleet or the Texel fleet could get out to sea and join the French, we should lose our control of the channel, and a French invasion of England or Ireland would become possible; and now that Bonaparte had turned back the Austrians, the whole French army was available for the assault on the British Isles. Masses of men began to assemble on the western coast of France for this purpose, and an "Army of England" was already formed in the winter of 1796-1797, of which the celebrated Hoche was made commander.

NAVAL MUTINIES (1797 A.D.)

While this black thunder-cloud was hanging on the horizon, and the government was also beginning to realise the imminence of the Irish danger, other troubles of the most serious sort sprang up to distract their attention. The first was the celebrated pair of naval mutinies at Spithead and the Nore in April, 1797. The sailors of the channel fleet, irritated by the monotonous and unending blockading work on which they were kept, and suffering from very real grievances in the way of harsh discipline, bad provisions, and low wages—the seamen's daily pay had not been increased since the time of Charles II—rose in mutiny and turned their officers ashore. This was not a Jacobin rising—as was feared at the time—but a colossal example of a "strike" for better conditions of labour. Richard Parker, one of the leaders, who tried to get the men to declare a "naval republic" and take the fleet over to France, was utterly unable to get the mutineers to follow him. When prom-

ised redress of grievances, which was actually carried out, they went back to their duty and allowed Parker and two others to be hanged.

But while the fleet was "on strike" the enemy's harbours were unguarded. Only a semblance of blockade had been kept up by a few ships which had not revolted, and the Brest and Texel squadrons would have found no one to oppose them if they had put to sea. Fortunately they were too late. When the Dutch fleet came out in the following October it was annihilated at Camperdown by Admiral Duncan and the ships which had been engaged in the mutiny at the Nore.

NAVAL VICTORIES: A FINANCIAL CRISIS

A little earlier the Spaniards came out of Cadiz with an even larger force, and were disgracefully beaten by Admiral Jervis (who had but fourteen ships to their twenty-seven) off Cape St. Vincent. These two naval victories somewhat improved the general situation; they prevented any possibility of that loss of the command of the channel which must inevitably have ruined England at this moment. But meanwhile internal affairs still looked most discouraging; the worst symptom of all had been a great financial panic in London, caused by the general doubt as to whether Great Britain's monetary resources had not sunk to a hopelessly low level. The "run" on the Bank of England was so prolonged and so heavy that its cash reserve was absolutely exhausted, and that great institution was saved from suspending payment of its debts only by a hasty device of the prime minister's. He ran a bill through the house of commons in a single day, which permitted the bank to refuse to pay in gold, and to tender its own notes as a legal substitute. A disaster which would have shaken English credit all over the world was thus averted; but the remedy was a perilous one, and it proved impossible to reintroduce cash payments for more than twenty years (February, 1797).

THE IRISH REBELLION (1798 A.D.)

In spite of Camperdown and St. Vincent the long-plotted Irish rebellion broke out in 1798. Fortunately it was absolutely unaided from without. The French fleet from Brest had run out during the winter of 1796-1797, and failed to land fifteen thousand men in Bantry Bay only because the senior military officer present (that same Grouchy who was to make his name better known in the Waterloo campaign) refused to put his troops ashore. His hierarchical superior Hoche had been blown back to Brest by a storm, and without him Grouchy refused to face the responsibility of landing, and took the expedition home. This was fortunate, as a general rising would have followed his appearance, and the rebels backed by so many French veterans would have been hard to deal with; any disaster might have ensued had Grouchy shown more pluck.

The actual rebellion did not burst out till sixteen months later. The Irish government, quite conscious of the danger, had been putting much energy into the task of disarming the country side, and hunting for the secret leaders of the plot. General Lake applied martial law to Ulster, and extorted fifty thousand muskets and seventy thousand pikes from intending rebels by the harshest measures. Before he had taken the south in hand a great explosion occurred. The central directory of the "United Irishmen" in Dublin was discovered, and Lord Edward Fitzgerald and the other chiefs were seized (May, 1798). On the receipt of this news the local chiefs gave

[1798-1799 A.D.]

the signal for a general rising; but guidance being wanting it was spasmodic and partial. Only in Leinster and some small part of Munster did it reach dangerous proportions. But even then it was strong enough to task all the resources of the government for its suppression. Its main centre was in County Wexford, where thirty thousand rebels took arms and defeated the first small detachment sent against them. They showed a fanatical Catholic spirit and massacred many unarmed Protestants, acts of savage folly which frightened their sympathisers in the north into quiescence, and drove the loyalist minority to fight for their lives with desperate energy. The rebellion was put down much more by the "yeomanry" raised by the Irish squirearchy than by the handful of regular troops garrisoned in the island. The vengeance taken, as was natural in a war of religion between near neighbours, was ruthless and indiscriminating—but the rebellion was crushed; after the battle of Vinegar Hill (June 26th, 1798) it died down in blood and ashes. When all was nearly over a small French expedition landed in Connaught; its position was hopeless, and after winning one small victory it was surrounded and forced to surrender.

Thus their own want of organisation and the tardiness of their French allies caused the failure of the Irish insurgents. The worst year of the war was now over, and Britain could breathe again; all through 1797-1798 she had been in more deadly peril than she has ever known in her later history. The rest of the war, exhausting as it proved to be, never tried her spirit or her resources as had this dreadful time, in which domestic discontent, naval mutiny, financial distress, open Irish rebellion, and the ever-threatening danger from a French invasion conspired to try, but never to shake, her resolution.

THE LAST STAGE OF THE WAR

The last stage of the revolutionary war began with the passing away of these dangers. France had now turned aside her eyes to other aims. Bonaparte, refusing to take in hand an invasion of England, went off on his brilliant but ill-advised Egyptian expedition. The directors meanwhile in sheer lust of plunder and conquest invaded Switzerland and attacked Rome and Naples. Their unscrupulous dealings led to a renewal of the continental war, and when Austria and Russia attacked them (February, 1799) the hour of Britain's peril was over. France had now other cares to distract her, and ceased to dream of invasions of the British Isles. She lost ground to the allies in Italy and on the Rhine, and her greatest general was absent, for Nelson had destroyed Bonaparte's fleet at the battle of the Nile (1st of August, 1798), and so shut up the French army in Egypt beyond hope of recall. Its chief, who had dreamed for a moment of conquering the East, and even of destroying the British Empire in India, saw his schemes foiled. Accordingly, when he got news of the disasters in Italy he deserted his troops, and escaped on a frigate to France, risking the peril of being captured by Nelson's cruisers.

There can be no doubt that the allies missed a great chance in 1799: they might have crushed the French before Bonaparte's return if they had combined their efforts. But the Austrians and Russians were at variance, while Britain wasted her force on colonial expeditions and on a fruitless invasion of Holland. The duke of York, who was placed in command despite his fiasco of 1794, showed himself as incapable as ever, and the British had to withdraw without having accomplished anything more than the capture of the remains of the Dutch fleet in the Texel.

The war, in short, had reached a standstill when Bonaparte returned from Egypt, overthrew the incapable and unpopular directory, and made himself supreme ruler under the title of First Consul (November, 1799). For the future Great Britain had to face as her enemy a military autocrat of transcendent talents, and not a republic guided by a committee of second-rate statesmen of varying degrees of honesty and ability. The whole character of the struggle was changed by this fact, but it was some time before the meaning of the change was realised on this side of the channel.

Ere long the two combatants were left alone, face to face; for the other participants in the war withdrew. The eccentric Czar Paul of Russia, disgusted with his English and Austrian allies, made peace with Bonaparte, and soon became his enthusiastic admirer. The Austrians, driven out of Lombardy by the first consul's triumph at Marengo (June 14th, 1800), and threatened nearer home by Moreau's victory in the snows of Hohenlinden (December 3rd, 1800), asked for forms of accommodation and obtained them by the Peace of Lunéville (February 9th, 1801). Thus Britain was left once more unaided to combat France.

Fortunately for her the redoubtable adversary with whom she had to contend did not possess the advantages that the Directory had enjoyed in 1797-1798. The British fleet had complete command of the seas: the Irish rebellion had been crushed; the financial crisis was over. Indeed, despite the heavy load of taxation, and the ever-growing weight of debt, piled up by Pitt's not over-skillful war-finance, the nation was prospering far better than could have been expected. The prime minister was able to point to the surprising and even paradoxical fact that British exports had gone up from £20,000,000 to £41,000,000 per annum since the struggle began, and that the tonnage of her seagoing ships had been increased by a fifth in the same time. The fact was that she had appropriated the carrying trade of Spain, France, and Holland, whose merchantmen had been captured, or lay idle in blockaded harbours. Moreover, her colonial empire was growing rapidly; many of the most important possessions of her enemies were now in her hands—such as Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Minorca, Trinidad, and most of the French West Indies. In Hindostan the Great Viceroy Wellesley had just struck down Tippoo, Sultan of Mysore, the ally of France (1799), and Britain was for the first time completely dominant in the southern part of the peninsula.

With good reason the nation faced the war against Bonaparte in a far more cheerful spirit than it had felt during 1797 and 1798. It made little difference that Pitt himself retired from office in February, 1801. He had in the previous year procured the union of the parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland, promising at the same time toleration and redress of grievances to the Irish Catholics. But George III, hopelessly obstinate when a point of conscience was involved, refused to consent to a bill for emancipating his Romanist subjects, and Pitt resigned when the king would not move. His place was taken by his pupil, Addington, a commonplace man, but one who carried out his master's policy so far as he was able.

It was his government which fought the last year of the revolutionary war to a finish, and a not unsuccessful one, though the peace was to prove no more than a truce. Austria had retired from the lists in February, 1801; Bonaparte was to come to terms in March, 1802. He had spent the thirteen months mainly in endeavouring to foster a new naval league against Britain; since the maritime resources of Spain, France, and Holland had run dry he tried to lure into his alliance the northern powers, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark. They had all been much aggrieved by the English doctrine that the

[1801-1802 A.D.]

neutral flag does not cover the goods of a belligerent on the high seas, the application of which by the ubiquitous British cruisers prevented them from trading with France. To resist this "maritime tyranny" they formed in concert an "armed neutrality," which, under Bonaparte's guidance, was rapidly developing into an offensive alliance against Britain. One of Pitt's last acts before resigning office had been to send off to the Baltic a fleet under Hyde Parker and Nelson, with orders to invite the allies to drop their scheme, and if they refused, to have recourse to armed force. The northern winter blocks the ports of the Baltic with ice, and it was possible to fall upon the confederates at the first spring thaw before they could get to sea and unite their squadrons. This scheme was carried out: the British passed the sound on March 30th, and confronted the Danes before the Swedes and Russians could stir. There followed the hard-fought battle of Copenhagen, in which Nelson, in spite of the timid orders of his commander-in-chief, Parker, forced his way into the Danish harbour, destroyed the greater part of the enemy's fleet, and forced the prince regent to withdraw his adhesion to the "armed neutrality." An attack on the Russians was to follow, but proved unnecessary, for a court conspiracy had made an end of Czar Paul ten days before the battle of Copenhagen. A party among his nobles, driven wild by his mad caprices and petty tyranny, had strangled him, and placed his son, Alexander, on the throne. The new sovereign dropped the French alliance, and was at once reconciled to England.

Thus Bonaparte's one promising scheme for the humbling of his adversary had failed. A few months later he received news that his army in Egypt, cut off since 1798 from all external aid, had been destroyed by a British expedition under Sir Ralph Abercromby (March, July, 1801). He had now no practicable means of injuring England; and as he was desirous of an interval of peace, in which to plant more firmly the foundations of his autocracy in France and to prepare for the assumption of a monarchical title, he consented to treat for a cessation of hostilities.

THE PEACE OF AMIENS

The plenipotentiaries of France and Great Britain were haggling about details all through the autumn of 1801 and the winter of 1801-1802. It was only on March 27th of the latter year that the Peace of Amiens was finally signed. It was avowedly a compromise and an experiment: Addington and his colleagues believed that Bonaparte was sincerely desirous of peace, and would prove a friendly neighbour if given handsome terms. They were aware that having already stripped France of her colonies, and being unable to attack her on land, England had little to gain from a prolongation of the war. The financial burden of the struggle was frightful: in 1801 alone £36,000,000 had been added to the national debt, and with an income of about £40,000,000 the state had to provide for an expenditure of £77,000,000. Accordingly they resolved that it was worth while to buy peace by surrendering nearly all our transmarine conquests of the last nine years. By the terms of the Treaty of Amiens we handed back everything that we had captured, save the Dutch island of Ceylon and the Spanish island of Trinidad. There was one more claim which required notice: Bonaparte had taken Malta from the moribund order of the Knights of St. John, in 1798. Two years later we had taken it from the French. The treaty provided that the order should be reconstituted, and that the British troops should restore it to the knights. Herein lay the *casus belli*, but not the real cause of the next war.

For a few months it was believed that a real settlement had been concluded, and that an equilibrium had been established in Europe. The Addington ministry hastened to dismantle the fleet and to disband the greater part of the army. But the dream that a long period of peace retrenchment and reform was at hand did not last for long.

The British ministers had wholly misconceived the intentions of Bonaparte. He had by no means forgiven them for foiling his eastern schemes and his plans in the Baltic. Colonial expansion and naval power had a prominent place in his plans for the future, and he saw clearly that they were impossible so long as Great Britain remained the mistress of the seas. He had made peace only in order to secure the restoration of the colonies of France, and to gain time to rebuild her shattered navy. His attitude and his policy during the year 1802 were anything but reassuring. Before the peace was three months old he had made the astonishing demand that the exiled princes of the old French royal house should be expelled from England, and that certain London newspapers which criticised his conduct should be suppressed. He steadfastly refused even to discuss the conclusion of a commercial treaty with Great Britain. In September he annexed Piedmont and Parma, and answered the questions addressed to him on the point by the British ambassador, with the insulting remark that continental affairs did not concern the Court of St. James. A little later he sent an army into Switzerland, and expelled a government which was not sufficiently subservient to him. Another of his provocative acts was the despatch of an expedition to annex Southern and Western Australia, for he affected to regard the English colony of New South Wales as covering no more than the eastern part of that continent.

At the same time French emissaries, civil and military, were busy not only in the British Isles, but in every part of the world where British interests were concerned. One of the things which most provoked Addington and his colleagues was the publication of a report on Egypt by one of their agents, General Sebastiani, which pointed out the ease with which France might recover that country and attract to herself the whole trade of the Levant.

Before the autumn was out the British cabinet had conceived grave doubts as to the stability of the Peace of Amiens. The First Consul's attitude seemed so provocative that they began to contemplate the possibility of renewed hostilities. They stopped the disarmament which had been nearly completed, and sent secret orders to delay the evacuation of Malta and of the French possessions in India. The other colonies of our late enemy had already been restored.

Bonaparte was probably not desirous of war at this moment; his irritating acts were merely symptoms of his usual arrogant and autocratic bearing towards all foreign powers. Possessed of a notion that the British cabinet was weak and would stand much bullying without returning a blow, he had displayed his normal temper towards them. But he did not wish to fight till his fleet had been rebuilt, his colonies strongly garrisoned, and his intended reorganisation of France completed. Hence he was no less angered than surprised when Addington and his colleagues refused to be overawed and showed fight. The main ostensible cause of friction was the question of Malta: when repeatedly urged by Bonaparte to evacuate it (although the order of St. John had not yet been reconstituted, so that there was no one to whom it could be handed over) the British ministry refused, referring to the late French annexation in Italy as their justification.

It was this refusal, coupled with the announcement by Addington at the opening of parliament that he was about to re-embody the militia and put

[1803 A.D.]

more ships into commission, which drove the First Consul to open hostilities. On March 13th, 1803, he delivered an angry allocution to the British ambassador at a great levée in the palace of the Tuileries. "Woe to those who break treaties!" he cried; "they shall answer for the consequences before all Europe"; adding that "you may be the first to draw the sword, but I shall be the last to return it to the scabbard."

OUTBREAK OF THE WAR WITH BONAPARTE (1803 A.D.)

This sort of hectoring is not diplomacy; the British cabinet rightly gathered from it that Bonaparte was irreconcilable. They hurried on war preparations, sent a final refusal to evacuate Malta, and on May 12th withdrew their ambassadors from Paris.

The war therefore recommenced long ere Bonaparte was ready. He had his own arrogance to thank for the rupture; if he had taken the trouble to conceal his malevolent intentions and feigned amity he might have obtained time to perfect all his preparations. He was now so angered at the precipitation of hostilities that he vented his wrath on the unfortunate English travellers and tourists in France, whom he would not suffer to depart home, but threw into captivity and detained to the end of the war, to the number of over ten thousand souls. Such cruel dealing with civilians was unheard of before or after.

The war with Bonaparte was destined to last for eleven continuous years (May, 1803, to April, 1814). It differed wholly in character from the war against the republic. The latter had been a war of opinions and principles. Great Britain had entered into it to resist the Jacobin propaganda and to defend constitutional monarchy. But the Napoleonic war was fought on no question of political theory, but to defend our national existence and our maritime supremacy from a tyrant who had shown that his ambitions were incompatible with the survival of the British Empire. It was, in short, a war for commerce, colonies, and naval predominance, such as we had already fought with France in the days of Louis XIV and Louis XV. The only difference was that Bonaparte was no common autocrat, but a soldier and statesman of transcendent genius wielding far greater resources than any of his predecessors who had borne rule in France. It was fortunate that despite all his genius he never succeeded in mastering the principles of naval warfare or of the exercise of sea power. He never could be brought to realise that a fleet cannot be manœuvred like an army corps, or that it was impossible for him to direct from Paris or Boulogne naval operations in the Atlantic or the southern Mediterranean.

The Napoleonic war falls into four sections. During the first (1803–1805) Britain was Bonaparte's sole enemy, and all his attention was absorbed in organising a great expedition for her invasion. He was foiled, and at the same moment a continental war broke out in his rear, and called away his army from the shores of the channel. The second period (1805–1807) embraces the years during which Great Britain refrained from engaging in land operations against Bonaparte, but subsidised against him the military powers of the Continent, to her and their discomfiture. In the third period (1808–1811) matters were changed by the fact that, having found a vulnerable point in the enemy's position, on the side of Spain, she kept an army in the field continuously, and distracted his forces in that direction. The drain on the resources of France was great, but no decisive success was obtained. Meanwhile Bonaparte was, on his side, endeavouring to ruin Britain by his "continental sys-

[1808 A.D.]

tem." He inflicted much damage thereby, but was as far from accomplishing his end as was Britain from achieving hers by the support of the Spanish insurrection. Meanwhile the fourth period (1812-1814) began. The "continental system" was as ruinous to Bonaparte's allies as to his enemies, and at last they revolted against it. Russia defied him, and in the attempt to reduce her he met his first crushing disaster in the snows of the retreat from Moscow. Then the other continental powers struck in to aid the czar, and in 1813 Bonaparte, overwhelmed by their numbers, was driven out of Germany. In the next year he was pursued into France, hunted down, and in spite of his desperate defence forced to abdicate.

From the British point of view therefore this fight to the death may be divided into two parts. During the first we fought against our enemy by sea, and finally made an end of the naval danger at Trafalgar. During the second we had to face, not an invasion, but an attack on our commerce and wealth—an attempt to bleed us to death if we could not be struck down by armed force. This injurious plan failed also, because Bonaparte in his zeal to ruin Britain was ruining all Europe also, and finally drew down upon himself a universal hatred under which he succumbed. All his later continental policy sprang from his attempt to destroy England and its inevitable consequences. This fact gives a unity to the whole of his career which is not at first sight apparent.

NAPOLEON'S PLANS

The history of the first three years of the war (1803-4-5) centres round Bonaparte's great invasion scheme. Fortunately for Britain he could not strike at once, since he had been caught unprepared. But while his fleet was being reorganised, he assembled an army of one hundred and fifty thousand on the shores of the channel, to the right and left of Boulogne. There is no reason to credit the statement which he made some years later, to the effect that he never really intended to attempt an invasion, and that the display at Boulogne was merely designed to frighten England and to give him the excuse for keeping a large army massed, for ulterior continental purposes. It seems certain that the scheme for a descent was perfectly genuine. At first Bonaparte intended to risk his army on board multitudes of flat-bottomed boats, which were to be conveyed across the channel by a fleet of small war vessels. When a gale had driven away the British blockading squadron, or a fog had arisen to shroud the sea, he hoped to make his dash for the coast of Kent and Sussex, without having taken the precaution of securing proper control of the Straits. He declared that he could get his whole army across in forty-eight hours, and that he asked for no more.

This project was rash in the extreme. A lift in the fog or a sudden change in the gale might have brought down the British men-of-war upon the fragile flotilla while it was still in mid-channel, which would have produced an awful and irretrievable disaster. Moreover, England had armed to the teeth; by the end of 1803 there were one hundred and twenty thousand regulars backed by seventy-eight thousand militia and three hundred and forty-seven thousand volunteers ready to receive the invading army. If the French slipped across, and the Straits was promptly closed behind them, would even the veterans of Italy be able to contend against odds of three to one? Though raw, the British levies were very numerous and desperately in earnest. The longer that Bonaparte looked at his original scheme the less he liked it. His army and his flotilla lay for long months without making the decisive move, a time

[1804-1805 A.D.]

of waiting which he utilised to complete his internal reorganisation of France by taking the imperial title, and crowning himself under the name of Napoleon I.

Meanwhile the threat of invasion kept England in a fever of expectation. For two whole years the nation was watching for the lighting of the beacons that were to announce that the French had begun to cross. It was an anxious time, and the delay was so long drawn out that the stress on the nation's nerves was even worse than in 1797-1798, though the real danger had been greater at the earlier crisis. But every precaution that could be devised was taken: the channel swarmed with men-of-war, and five hundred thousand men were ready to march for the coast at a moment's notice. To guide the nation in the time of peril Pitt was recalled to office, Addington retiring in his favour in May, 1804.

FUTILE ATTEMPT AT INVASION

But the invasion never came: Napoleon shrank from risking his new empire on the fate of his flat-bottomed boats, and fell back on a safer and less hazardous scheme. He resolved to try to get full possession of the channel by the concentration of a great fleet in the Dover Straits. For this purpose he not only resolved to concentrate his own reorganised squadrons, but to bring up the whole navy of Holland and Spain. For Spain had been dragged into the war once again (December, 1804), and her numerous, if inefficient, fleet was now at the emperor's disposal. The great naval scheme of 1805 was one of Bonaparte's most ingenious plans. His Toulon squadron, which Nelson was blockading, was to slip out to sea when a lucky gale had driven the British squadron out of sight. It was then to make for the Atlantic, and pick up the Spanish fleet at Cadiz. The united armada was then to set sail for the West Indies, in the hope that Nelson would pursue it into those remote seas. But having crossed the Atlantic it was to swerve sharply back, and make for Brest, where the largest French squadron was being blockaded by Admiral Cornwallis. Nelson meanwhile, it was supposed, would be vainly seeking for it at Barbadoes or Jamaica. But while he was out of the game, the Franco-Spanish fleet would raise the blockade of Brest, and appear in the channel sixty vessels strong. It would be long months before the British admiralty could assemble a squadron strong enough to fight such an enormous force, and meanwhile the invasion could be carried out, while the control of the Dover Straits was entirely in the hands of the imperial navy. This was a splendid scheme on paper, but did not allow for the chances of the ocean, or the superior seamanship of the British admirals.

But much of the design was duly executed. Villeneuve, the commander of the Toulon squadron, actually slipped out to sea unmolested (March 29th, 1805), passed Gibraltar, and rallied the Spaniards at Cadiz. But these unwilling allies were not ready to sail, and the French admiral could only take on six Spanish ships to join his own twelve. Nevertheless, he made the prescribed dash out into the Atlantic, and reached Martinique on May 13th. Nelson meanwhile had been long in gaining correct information as to the destination of the hostile fleet; he looked for it off Sicily and Egypt, and only got upon the right track on May 9th. On that day he sailed from Gibraltar for Barbadoes with only eleven ships. Meanwhile Villeneuve made demonstration among the British West India islands, to produce the impression that this was the true end of his expedition, and on June 4th turned back towards Europe. Nelson reached Barbadoes on that same day, vainly sought for the

[1805 A.D.]

French, and suddenly divining their real purpose put about and returned to Europe as quickly as he could sail. He was now only nine days behind the enemy. Meanwhile Villeneuve's chance was slipping from his hands. Owing to the inferior seamanship of his crews he made a very slow passage back to Europe—he had started on June 4th, but it was July 23rd before he drew near Cape Finisterre, the western headland of Spain. Nelson made the same voyage in only thirty-seven days—starting from Barbadoes on June 13th he reached Gibraltar on July 20th; having thus gained twelve days on his adversary he actually got back three days before him. The main point of Napoleon's scheme was thus foiled, for Nelson was actually ahead of his adversary instead of being astray in the Carribean Sea.

But it was not Nelson whom Villeneuve had first to fight. Off Cape Finisterre he was surprised to find a hostile fleet barring his passage. A fast-sailing English brig had sighted him on his return voyage, had passed him unseen, and made for Portsmouth. With commendable speed the British admiralty sent the news on to Admiral Cornwallis off Brest, and directed him to detach half his fleet to discover the approaching enemy and fight him far out at sea. These fifteen vessels under Calder found Villeneuve and assailed him, though he was superior in numbers by three ships. The combat of Cape Finisterre was not decisive, but Villeneuve lost two vessels and took refuge in the port of Ferrol, where he could reinforce himself with a new Spanish squadron (July 24th, 1805).

NELSON'S VICTORY AND DEATH

Napoleon's game was now up: the British knew Villeneuve's whereabouts, and Nelson was back in Spanish waters. If the French admiral had taken his fate in his hands and sailed out of Ferrol towards Brest, there can be little doubt that he would have been destroyed at once, since Calder could have been reinforced up to a strength quite sufficient to insure him victory. Napoleon hoped that his admiral would take the risk and push for Brest and the channel. But Villeneuve was not the man to accept such a tremendous responsibility: he resolved to pick up the main Spanish squadron from Cadiz before fighting. Accordingly he turned south and not north, and reached his chosen destination. He had now thirty-three ships in hand, but to his dismay Nelson's and Calder's fleets appeared a few days later with a force of twenty-seven sail and established a strict blockade over him. The only result, in short, of six months of elaborate naval manoeuvres was that Villeneuve was now shut up in Cadiz instead of in Toulon.

When the news reached Boulogne that the Franco-Spanish fleet had sailed for Cadiz instead of for Brest the emperor saw clearly that his great scheme had failed. After a wild explosion of wrath against his admiral, his fleet, and his Spanish allies, Napoleon threw up the whole plan for the invasion of England. Without the aid of a powerful squadron in the channel he would not risk his army on the water. Moreover, he had just learned that there was danger behind him: Austria and Russia were coming in his rear. But before giving orders for the "grand army" to march from Boulogne for the Rhine, the emperor wrote an angry epistle to Villeneuve, taunting him with cowardice and declaring that the failure of the invasion scheme was wholly due to his indecision and reluctance to fight: a successor of sterner stuff was already on the way to supersede him.

This letter had an unexpected result, quite the reverse of what the writer intended. To vindicate his own courage Villeneuve sallied out from Cadiz,

[1805 A.D.]

though he was convinced that he was going to destruction. He was perfectly right: off Cape Trafalgar Nelson fell upon him, and though he had but twenty-seven ships to the Franco-Spanish thirty-three, inflicted upon them the most crushing naval defeat of modern days.

[Nelson's plan of attack was to bear down upon the enemy in two columns, and thus break the line in two places at once. In this way he thought it was most likely that each ship would be brought speedily into close action with its antagonist, and the greatest chance of decisive success be obtained. Villeneuve's instructions, as the British lay to windward, were to lie in close order and await the attack. The fleet was drawn up in two lines, and so arranged on the whole that at the interstices of each two vessels in the front line the broadside of one in the second presented itself—a combination as well imagined as can be conceived to meet the anticipated British manœuvre of breaking the line. The front line, commanded by Villeneuve himself and admirals Alava and Dumanoir, consisted of twenty-one line-of-battle ships; twelve under admirals Gravina and Magon formed the second. Villeneuve's instructions to his captains were general: to obey the signals he might make during the action, and to use their utmost efforts to come to close action with their opponents. "Every captain is at his post if he is in fire." Such was his last order, and it was worthy of the brave nation whose armament he commanded. Collingwood, in the *Royal Sovereign*, led the first column of the British, followed closely by the *Belleisle* and *Mars*; Nelson himself, in the *Victory*, headed the second, immediately after whom came the *Temeraire* and the *Neptune*. When the lines were completely formed, and the ships bearing rapidly down on the enemy, so that it was evident an engagement was inevitable, Nelson retired to his cabin and wrote the following prayer: "May the great God whom I worship grant to my country, and for the benefit of Europe in general, a great and glorious victory, and may no misconduct in anyone tarnish it; and may humanity after victory be the predominant feature in the British fleet! For myself individually, I commit my life to Him that made me, and may his blessing alight on my endeavours for serving my country faithfully. To him I resign myself and the just cause which is intrusted me to defend."

Never did the ocean exhibit a grander spectacle than was presented by the British fleet bearing down on the combined squadrons, at noon on the 21st October, a few leagues to the northwest of Cape Trafalgar. A long swell was setting into the Bay of Cadiz; our ships, crowding all their canvas, moved majestically before it, with light winds from the northwest. Right before them lay the mighty armament of France and Spain, the sun shining full on their close-set sails, and the vast three-deckers which it contained appearing of stupendous magnitude amid the lesser line-of-battle ships by which they were surrounded. Nelson asked Captain Blackwood what he should deem a victory. That officer answered, he should consider it a glorious result if fourteen were taken; but Nelson replied, he should not be satisfied with less than twenty. He then made signal for the British fleet to prepare to anchor at the close of the day; and when it was given, asked the captain whether he did not think there was another wanting. After musing awhile, he fixed what it should be; and the signal appeared at the mast-head of the *Victory*, the last he ever made, which will be remembered as long as the British name shall endure: "England expects that every man will do his duty." It was received by a rapturous shout throughout the fleet.^e

In the Painted Hall of Greenwich, under a glass cover, is the admiral's coat which Nelson wore on that 21st of October. On its left side are four

[1805 A.D.]

embroidered stars, the emblems of the orders with which he was invested. He was implored to put on a plainer dress, for there were riflemen among the four thousand troops which were on board the French and Spanish ships. No. What he had won he would wear. On the deck he stood, a mark for the enemy—one whose life was worth a legion. There was a carelessness about his own safety that day which was chivalrous, however unwise. He was persuaded to allow some other vessel to take the lead in his line. He gave a reluctant order, but he made every effort to counteract it, for he would not shorten sail himself. Collingwood, at the head of his line, made all sail, steering right through the enemy's centre. "See how that noble fellow carries his ship into action!" said Nelson. "What would Nelson give to be here!" said Collingwood. Collingwood was spared to write the despatch which told England of its gain and of its loss.

"The action began at twelve o'clock, by the leading ships of the columns breaking through the enemy's line; the commander-in-chief about the tenth ship from the van, the second in command, about the twelfth from the rear, leaving the van of the enemy unoccupied, the succeeding ships breaking through, in all parts, astern of their leaders, and engaging the enemy at the muzzles of their guns. The conflict was severe; the enemy's ships were fought with a gallantry highly honourable to their officers; but the attack on them was irresistible, and it pleased the Almighty Disposer of events to grant his majesty's arms a complete and glorious victory. . . . Such a battle could not be fought without sustaining a great loss of men. I have not only to lament, in common with the British navy and the British nation, in the fall of the commander-in-chief the loss of a hero whose name will be immortal and his memory ever dear to his country, but my heart is rent with the most poignant grief for the death of a friend, to whom, by many years' intimacy, and a perfect knowledge of the virtues of his mind, which inspired ideas superior to the common race of men, I was bound by the strongest ties of affection; a grief to which even the glorious occasion in which he fell does not bring that consolation which perhaps it ought."

The moving circumstances of the death of Nelson have been told by Southey with a touching fulness which has found its way to many a heart of the past and the present generations. He was shot from the mizzen-top of the *Redoubtable*, which he supposed had struck. He fell where his secretary had previously fallen. "They have done for me at last," he said to Captain Hardy; "my backbone is shot through." He was carried below, covering his face and his stars with his handkerchief, that his crew might not see who had fallen. His wound was soon perceived to be mortal. Every now and then a ship struck, and the crew of the *Victory* huzzaed. Then his eyes lighted up for a moment. He lingered in great agony for a little more than three hours. The last guns which were fired at the flying enemy were heard a minute or two before he expired. Twenty of the French and Spanish ships had struck. But a gale came on; some of the prizes went down; others were wrecked on shore; one escaped into Cadiz; four only were saved. Four of the ships that made off during the action were captured on the 4th of November, by Sir Richard Strachan. The French and Spanish navies never recovered, during the war, this tremendous blow. Napoleon's projects of invasion were at an end.

It was the 7th of November when Collingwood's despatches reached London. Pitt was roused in the night to read them. He said, a day or two after, that he had been called up at various times by the arrival of news, "but that whether good or bad he could always lay his head on his pillow and sink

[1805 A.D.]

into sound sleep again. On this occasion, however, the great event announced brought with it so much to weep over, as well as to rejoice at, that he could not calm his thoughts, but at length got up, though it was three in the morning." The same feeling pervaded all, when the body of the hero was borne to St. Paul's, on the 9th of January.

The pageant (says Knight) lives in the ineffaceable remembrance of our boyhood. Six and forty years afterwards the remembrance crowded upon our thoughts, when we beheld the car of another warrior moving through the same streets to the same place of rest. Mute veneration for him who died, full of years, while every year he lived added to a nation's love, marked the funeral pomp of Wellington. Impassioned grief, audible sighs, tears coursing down rugged cheeks, marked the funeral pomp of Nelson. They sleep together in the same crypt beneath the dome of St. Paul's—the two who in the agony of England's fate best fought the fight and achieved the victory.^d]

NAPOLEON'S SUCCESSES ON THE LAND

Already before Trafalgar was fought Napoleon was contending with a new enemy on the banks of the Danube. The departure of the army of invasion from Boulogne had been caused by the attitude of Austria and Russia. Both those powers had viewed with dislike Bonaparte's arrogant policy of annexation, and his avowed intention of exercising an ascendancy over the smaller states of central Europe. For he was already posing as the "successor of Charlemagne," and stretching his hand far into Germany. His most astonishing act of aggression had been to send an armed force across the frontier of the empire into the territory of Baden, in order to apprehend an exiled French prince, the duke of Enghien. After kidnapping the unhappy young man on neutral ground, he had him shot by court-martial on a false accusation of being concerned in a royalist plot at Paris (March, 1804). The czar and the emperor Francis were both eager to humble France, and they were trying to lure into their alliance the king of Prussia, whose real interests were the same as their own. Pitt lent them encouragement, and promised them subsidies, though it is incorrect to assert (as did Napoleon) that he stirred up the whole scheme in order to relax the French pressure on Great Britain.

Getting wind of the new alliance, Bonaparte resolved to strike before it was complete, and suddenly declared war on Austria and Russia. The army mobilised at Boulogne was ready to his hand, and long before the enemy was prepared he had invaded Germany. After routing the Austrians he captured the greater part of their army at Ulm (October 10th, 1805). Hurrying on, he seized Vienna before the Russians had come upon the scene. Prussia, which displayed all through these years a most mean and double-dealing policy, kept out of the strife and was bought off by the offer of Hanover, which Napoleon threw to her as a sop to distract her attention. It was, therefore, with the czar's troops alone, supported by the wrecks of the Austrians, that Bonaparte had to do when he advanced from Vienna and fought the battle of Austerlitz (December 2nd, 1805). The allies received such a crushing defeat that the emperor Francis sued for peace at once, while the Russians sullenly retired eastward within their own borders.

Austerlitz was a great blow not only to Austria and Russia but to England also. The renewal of the continental war, and the removal of the French army from Boulogne had been felt as a great relief, and the most sanguine expectation had been nourished that the fall of Bonaparte was at hand.

[1806-1807 A.D.]

The revulsion of feeling was therefore very great when the confederacy broke up and the emperor remained triumphant. It is often said that the news of Austerlitz killed William Pitt; but this is an exaggeration. He had been worn to the shadow of himself by the long stress of the expected invasion in 1804-1805, and was already failing long before the catastrophe which broke up the great coalition. He died on June 23rd, 1806, at a moment of great national depression, when it had been realised by everyone that Trafalgar had not ended the war, and that the days of trouble were not yet concluded.

Napoleon however was still far from being at leisure to concentrate his attention once more on England. He did not march back his grand army to the shores of the channel, nor did he make any special effort to replace the fleet lost at Trafalgar. But he was still irreconcilable, and was far from having given up his determination to bring Britain to her knees. It was only because he had still urgent business on the Continent, and another war impending with a great military power, that he did not once more turn his whole mind to the English war. But that no accommodation with him was possible was clearly shown in 1806. After Pitt's death there had been a great political reconstruction in London; it was impossible to replace the lost master-spirit by any single leader. But the experiment was made of offering seats in the cabinet to the chief members of the whig opposition, in order to combine "all the talents" available for the guidance of the empire. Accordingly Fox, Sheridan, Erskine, and other whigs formed a coalition government along with Lord Grenville, Addington, and several more disciples of Pitt. Fox was not yet convinced that peace with Bonaparte was impossible; he had formed an optimistic and erroneous estimate of the emperor's intentions. Accordingly he got leave to open negotiations with France; but he was soon undeceived. Napoleon offered terms that were insulting and ridiculous, considering that his schemes for attacking England had been foiled, and that her maritime supremacy was far more complete and undisputed than it had been at any previous date since 1793. After long endeavours to arrive at a reasonable basis of peace Fox had to withdraw, and to confess that he had been deceived in his hopes and that continued war was inevitable. Soon afterwards he died (September, 1806), only nine months after his great rival Pitt. The coalition ministry only survived him for a short space, and resigned in March, 1807. Their peace policy had been a failure, their practical administration had proved far inferior to that of the tory ministry which preceded them, and they were at variance among themselves. Taking the opportunity of the king's declared intention of vetoing a Catholic emancipation bill which they had framed they retired. To replace them a new tory cabinet was formed, under the nominal presidency of the duke of Portland; but the really important personages in it were George Canning, the foreign secretary, and Lord Castlereagh, the secretary for war. Both were able and energetic, and each thoroughly well understood the fact that Great Britain was committed to a life-and-death struggle with Bonaparte, from which there was no withdrawing. Unfortunately Canning and Castlereagh were personal enemies, and though their political views were at this time coincident, it was hard to get them to work well together.

During the latter months of the coalition government and the early days of the Portland cabinet the situation on the Continent had been profoundly modified. After Austerlitz Napoleon had turned upon Prussia, determined to punish her for her double-dealing and mean selfishness during the last struggle. The moment that his hands were free from the Austrian war, he assumed a haughty and provocative attitude towards her. He alarmed

[1806-1807 A.D.]

her by forming the states of central and southern Germany into the Confederation of the Rhine, of which he made himself president and supreme arbiter. But his main offence was a project for resuming possession of Hanover, which he had allowed Prussia to occupy in the preceding year, in order that he might use the electorate as a bribe in his negotiations with England. This insulting proposal soon came to the ears of the Prussian court, and aroused such anger that the timid king and his opportunist ministers were driven into war by an explosion of national feeling. Relying on the promised help of Russia and the old military reputation of their army, they rushed into war completely unprepared.

This was what Napoleon had intended; he had already mobilised his army in southern Germany in a position from which he could take Prussia in the flank. The moment that war was declared he marched in overpowering strength from the valley of the Main across the Thüringerwald, and fell upon the enemy as they were advancing across his front in the direction of the Rhine. An awful disaster ensued; the Prussian army, over-confident in the old military traditions of Frederick the Great, and led by senile generals, fell a helpless victim to the emperor's strategy. Out-fought, out-marched, and out-flanked, it fled from the fields of Jena and Auerstadt (October 14th, 1806), only to fall piecemeal into the victor's hands. Of one hundred and fifty thousand veterans only twelve thousand escaped beyond the Oder and got away towards the Russian frontier. The czar meanwhile had been pushing his army towards the seat of war, but long before he was in touch with the French the forces of his ally had been absolutely annihilated.

NAPOLÉON'S NEW PROJECT AGAINST ENGLAND (1806 A.D.)

It was after his triumphant entry into Berlin and before he marched on to encounter the Russians, that Napoleon found a moment of leisure in which to make it manifest that he had not forgotten England. In October, 1806, he published his famous Berlin Decrees, which represent the result of his ponderings since Austerlitz on the best manner of attacking Great Britain. Abandoning as impracticable his former plans of actual invasion, he had now conceived a vast scheme for bringing about the ruin of his adversary by cutting off the channels of supply of her national wealth. He reasoned to himself that she was dependent for resources on her carrying trade and on her enormous profits which she made by selling her manufactures abroad. If therefore he could prevent all Europe from buying not only her own goods, but even all goods brought from the East and the West in her ships, he imagined that he could produce such widespread distress and bankruptcy within her borders that she would speedily be brought to her knees. Accordingly the Berlin Decrees declared all British goods and all goods borne in British ships contraband over the whole region over which his power extended—France, Italy, Holland, the Confederation of the Rhine, Switzerland, and Spain—for his allies were compelled to join him in enforcing this extensive "boycott" of British trade. Having thus launched his thunderbolt against the old enemy, he marched on to encounter the new foe—the armies of Czar Alexander.

The two campaigns that followed in Poland and East Prussia were far more severe work than the emperor had yet encountered in his whole career. The desperate fighting in the mud and snow of a poor and thinly peopled region thinned the ranks and tried the *morale* of his army almost to the edge of ruin. At Eylau the Russians repulsed him, and only failed to

[1807 A.D.]

gain the advantage of victory because they retired from the field next morning. But the spring brought food and reinforcements to the emperor, and after the decisive battle of Friedland (June 14th, 1807) the czar Alexander asked for terms of peace. He was granted more favourable conditions than he had expected at the Treaty of Tilsit. Napoleon fell heavily upon Prussia, stripped her of half her territory, imposed a vast war indemnity, and placed permanent French garrisons in her fortresses. But he exacted nothing from Russia save an engagement to adhere to the "continental system" and to close her ports to English trade. It was his aim at this time to conciliate the czar rather than to crush him; he professed warm friendship for him and encouraged him to set forth on schemes of territorial aggression against Turkey and Sweden which would keep him out of Western politics.

BONAPARTE'S SUPREMACY

After Tilsit Bonaparte was supreme in Europe as he had never been before. There was no continental power left to balance his weight. Prussia had been dismembered, Austria had been humbled, and Russia was now his obsequious friend. He had planted out his family in new kingdoms cut out of his conquests. Of his brothers, Joseph was now king of Naples, Jerome king of Westphalia, Louis king of Holland; his sisters had been given appanages in Italy, and his brother-in-law the broad dukedom of Berg on the lower Rhine. All the Continent, with the insignificant exceptions of Turkey, Sweden, and Portugal, was at his disposition. Now, therefore, was the time for prosecuting his great design against England: by the Milan Decrees of December, 1807, which carried out the Berlin Decrees to their logical extreme, he declared the whole British Isles in a "state of blockade" so far as the Continent was concerned (a ludicrous perversion of the actual fact). To prevent the indirect permeation of British goods into the sphere of his power on neutral ships, he made two additional rules: (1) that a foreign vessel which had touched at any port in the British dominions should be excluded from the harbours of France and her allies, and (2) that goods that could be identified as British might be seized and destroyed wherever found.

Even before this last fulmination of the enemy, the British cabinet, provoked by the Berlin Decrees, had replied by publishing two "Orders in Council" (November, 1807), which turned the emperor's devices against himself. By these every port in France and the other states in the Napoleonic sphere of influence was declared to be in a state of blockade, and neutral vessels were warned that on trying to enter them they would be regarded as legitimate prizes for the British navy, unless they could prove that since leaving home they had touched at a British harbour. As Napoleon had already made such a visit prohibitory for any vessel that wished to trade with his dominions, the position of the unfortunate neutral was made impossible. The United States of America, the one great oceanic trading power outside the European state system, was particularly hard hit, and declaimed with justice against both the combatants in the great struggle in the Old World.

The continental system had many and various results, but they were by no means those which Napoleon had hoped and expected. He had been influenced by the old political economy of the French "physiocratic school," who taught that wealth derived from trade and commerce was essentially precarious and unreal: hence he imagined that Great Britain would collapse after a short agony of bankruptcy. But though he had inflicted grave injury upon her by closing so many of her regular markets, she was

[1807 A.D.]

much less harmed than he supposed. Though the manufacturers that worked for the continental trade were hard hit, though there was distress and want of work in many a north country industrial centre, yet there were many sources of wealth that he could not touch. The trade with the colonies, with Africa, India and China, and the Levant was wholly beyond his control. Nor could he influence the domestic consumption of the British Isles, which were (after all) their own most important market. It is more surprising to find that he could not even effectually cut off the intercourse of England with his own allies and subjects. "Trade will find out a way," and the most prominent economic result of the continental system was to produce the most enormous and elaborate system of smuggling that has ever been seen. In spite of hundreds of thousands of coast guards and *douaniers* strung out along the water's edge from St. Petersburg to Trieste, British goods continued to enter the Continent. The desire for them was so great, and the profit from retailing them so enormous, that the English and continental smugglers gladly took the risk. From the shores of Great Britain herself, from outlying ports like Heligoland and Gibraltar and Malta, from harbours in the hands of our allies like Palermo and Cagliari, the contraband goods were shot ashore at night in spite of Napoleon's agents and all their inquisitorial zeal. At last smuggling became so highly organised a trade that English goods were conveyed by it to every corner of Europe, and the French officials began to wink at it for their own private profit. But the last pitch of absurdity was reached when Napoleon himself in 1813, hard pressed for greatcoats to clothe his army, contracted with smugglers to procure him many thousand yards of Yorkshire frieze, and duly paid for them money that went into English pockets.

This incident was but a symptom of the general fact that the continental system hit France and her allies much more heavily than England. Of the British and colonial goods that were excluded some could not be replaced at all by continental manufactures; others could only be supplied in insufficient quantities or of inferior quality. Hence came a widely felt dearth of luxuries and even necessities which brought the miseries of the war and the obstinacy of the emperor home to every individual among his subjects and allies. Every household that had to pay two francs a pound for inferior beet sugar, or to substitute chicory for coffee, cursed the continental system. If this repressed anger was not unknown in France, it was rampant in Germany and Russia, where the suffering was endured purely for the profit of Napoleon and for no national end of the sufferers. In short, the Berlin Decrees had no small share in preparing Europe for the great rising which overthrew the tyrant in the year 1813.

The emperor had not long put the continental system in working order, when he started off on a new enterprise which was to be even more directly the cause of his fall. Portugal had been almost the last corner of Europe where British trade still found an entrance. In the autumn of 1807 Bonaparte summoned the Portuguese government to close Lisbon and Oporto; on their hesitation (for this weak power did not actually refuse) he sent an army under Junot across Spain, which hunted the prince regent across the sea to Brazil, and seized the whole country. But though Portugal was conquered, the emperor continued to force more and more troops into the territory of his Spanish allies, till more than one hundred thousand men were cantoned between Madrid and Bayonne. This inexplicable massing of troops in a friendly country covered a most villanous design. Napoleon had resolved to lay hands on Spain, to dethrone the reigning imbecile dynasty, and to place a relative of his own upon the throne. The worthless Bourbons played

[1808-1809 A.D.]

into his hands, for a deadly quarrel had broken out between King Charles IV and his heir Ferdinand, who resented the predominance in the state of his father's arrogant favourite, Godoy. By a *coup d'état* at Aranjuez Ferdinand dethroned his father (March, 1808); the emperor refused to recognise the new king, and summoned him and his father to Bayonne, promising to arbitrate between them. When both hastened to meet him, he suddenly declared to them that he had resolved to place a new dynasty on the Spanish throne, and bade them abdicate. Charles resigned readily enough, out of hatred for his son; Ferdinand had to be threatened with death before he would sign away his rights. But at last he yielded, and Napoleon then declared his own brother, Joseph, king of Spain. By his treacherous preliminary moves Madrid and all the border fortresses of the realm were already in his hands.

The emperor had looked with contempt on the miserable Bourbons and their ill-governed, priest-ridden, bankrupt subjects. He never suspected for a moment that Spain was to be his ruin. But to his surprise the whole nation flew to arms, and in the first days of the insurrection the raw levies of Andalusia surrounded, beat, and captured a whole French army corps of eighteen thousand men at Baylen (July 20th, 1808). The French were thrust back to the Ebro, and at the same moment an English army under Sir Arthur Wellesley (the brother of the great governor-general of India) landed in Portugal, beat at Vimiero (August 21st) the army of Junot, and forced the French to evacuate the country under the Convention of Cintra.

This was the worst disaster, and the most righteously earned, that Napoleon had yet suffered. In high wrath he summoned out of Germany his "grand army," and fell upon the Spaniards. Their raw armies were scattered to the winds by the overwhelming number of his veterans, and Madrid was soon replaced in French hands (December 4th). A month later the British army from Portugal was driven back to the sea, and forced to embark after a battle at Corunna (January 16th, 1809). Its commander, Sir John Moore, lost his life, but repulsed his pursuers so as to secure a quiet embarkation for his troops.

Napoleon now supposed that the Spanish war was practically ended, and returned to Paris where new diplomatic developments demanded his presence. The Austrian government had been watching the Peninsular War with keen attention, and when the emperor had drawn off two hundred and fifty thousand men into Spain, imagined that the moment had come to attack him in the rear and avenge Austerlitz. Napoleon could not withdraw his veterans from Spain, and was forced to meet this new enemy at the head of an army hastily organised from his reserves, his garrisons in Germany, and his subject allies. Yet after a desperate struggle, and an actual defeat at Essling, he triumphed at Wagram (July 6th, 1809), and forced the emperor Francis to cede him at the Peace of Schönbrunn the maritime provinces of Austria and the hand of his daughter, Marie Louise. The annexation of Trieste and Illyria was insisted on because it enabled the continental system to be applied more vigorously in the Adriatic. By the Austrian marriage Bonaparte hoped to found a dynastic alliance with his late enemy, and for that reason made the terms of peace far less onerous than those which he had imposed on Prussia under similar circumstances at Tilsit.

WELLINGTON IN SPAIN (1809-1812 A.D.)

From the English point of view the year 1809 is mainly notable, not for the campaign of Wagram, but for the final determination taken in this spring to commit the British army to a great land war on the Continent. Hitherto

[1809-1810 A.D.]

the military expeditions of the various cabinets had aimed at little more than what Sheridan called "a policy of filching sugar-islands," i.e., at spasmodic colonial expeditions. Their attempts to employ troops on the Continent had been few, irresolute, and ill-conducted. In 1809, after Moore's retreat to Corunna, many persons had expected that we should retire from the Spanish war as a hopeless failure. Fortunately Lord Castlereagh persuaded his colleagues to send back Sir Arthur Wellesley, the victor of Assaye and Vimiera, to the peninsula, and to reinforce his corps up to a strength of thirty thousand men. It was a great mistake that he was not also given control of another army corps of the same strength, which was despatched in an ill-managed expedition against Antwerp, to sicken and melt away in the swamps of the isle of Walcheren.

But even with the moderate force placed at his disposal Wellesley beat the French out of Portugal (May, 1809) and then, pushing for Madrid, defeated them again at Talavera (July 28th). If the Spanish troops had given him effective help he would have retaken the capital, but his victory drew down upon him overwhelming numbers and he had to retire and assume a defensive position on the Portuguese frontier. Yet to force him back even thus far the French had to evacuate Galicia and other Spanish districts which they never regained, so that the balance of profit on the campaign was decidedly on his side.

It was this campaign of 1809 which showed that Britain had at last found a competent general, and encouraged her ministers to resolve to persist in continental operations, which might bleed Napoleon to death by long exhaustion. Spain and Portugal offered a peculiarly favourable field for British interference. The cynical wickedness of Bonaparte's methods of assailing Spain had roused a feeling of savage and fanatical patriotism in the country, and for the first time the French had to face a really national revolt against their ascendancy. Though the emperor kept two hundred and fifty thousand men in the peninsula, and though his armies beat with ease the raw Spanish levies which were opposed to them, yet they never could gain a firm hold upon the land. No town would submit to Joseph Bonaparte unless it was kept down by a garrison; no district would remain quiet unless it was perpetually controlled by flying columns. Everywhere the bands of guerillas swarmed in the hills, and descended to annihilate small detachments and to capture convoys. It took an escort of five hundred men to carry a message from one French general to another, even when they were but one hundred miles apart. Hence, although the emperor had a quarter of a million of men upon the spot, they were mainly frittered away on police and garrison duty, and could never manage to occupy the whole peninsula. A removal of troops to an expedition in one corner always meant that the region from which they were withdrawn blazed up in a new insurrection. The war was horribly bloody and cruel on both sides; the French shot all guerillas as bandits; in retaliation these desperate outlaws murdered without pity every straggler or outpost sentinel whom they could surprise. Whole districts were depopulated, whole regiments used up in this inglorious warfare of ambush and assassination. Meanwhile the British kept the main armies of the French distracted by sallies from Portugal, by throwing a garrison into Cadiz (1810), and afterwards by landing troops on the east coast of Spain (1812-1814). Wellesley (now created Viscount Wellington for his victory of Talavera) was by turns the most cautious and the most enterprising of generals. When outnumbered he retired into the inaccessible Portuguese mountains; while the moment that the famished enemy desisted from pursuing him he returned to molest the borders of Spain.

[1810-1811 A.D.]

A year had passed since the Peace of Schönbrunn when Napoleon, beginning to realise the difficulties of the Spanish War, resolved to make an end of it. It was also growing too tedious and costly for his taste, and showed no signs of coming to a close. Accordingly he sent against Wellington the greatest of his lieutenants, Marshal Masséna, with two fresh army corps drawn from Germany. Adding these to the troops already on the Portuguese frontier, Masséna should have had one hundred thousand men to crush Wellington's thirty thousand and the levies of Portugal. But the need of protecting his rear and communication from the Spanish insurgents prevented him from using his whole force. Nevertheless he came on in such overwhelming strength that Wellington was obliged to retire before him to his final stronghold, the celebrated lines of Torres Vedras. Here the British commander, unsuspected by his enemy, had drawn a triple line of intrenchments and forts across the Lisbon peninsula, and stood at bay in an impregnable position with the sea on either hand. Masséna could get no further forward, and meanwhile the insurgents had closed in behind him, and cut his communication with Spain. For nearly five months (October, 1810–February, 1811) he remained encamped in front of the lines, while his army melted away from famine and disease. Wellington had devastated the country side and compelled the Portuguese peasantry to take refuge in his lines, so that the French were left in an artificial desert. Even by the fertile banks of the lower Tagus they died of sheer starvation. At last, after seeing more than a third of his army perish, Masséna was forced to cut his way back to Spain and to announce to his angry master that he had failed. Wellington, like Fabius of old, had discomfited his foe by refusing to fight rash battles in the open and relying on cold and hunger as his best auxiliaries.

It was a great day for Britain and for Europe when the ruined army of Masséna recoiled from the gates of Lisbon. The prestige of the emperor was far more damaged by this check than by the disaster of Baylen or any other previous failure, for the beaten commander was the greatest of the marshals, and he had been intrusted with a larger force than Bonaparte had ever before placed under one of his lieutenants. The only way to have repaired the blow to French moral ascendancy in Europe would have been for the emperor himself to have taken the field against Wellington in the summer of 1811, with another enormous army of reinforcements at his back. Bonaparte thought for a moment of doing so, but finally came to the conclusion that he could not afford to risk himself in the far southwest, leaving behind him the universal hatred of the powers of central Europe.

The fact was that by now the continental system was working out its logical result—not the one that Napoleon had expected. The general ruin that it brought about all over Europe had made whole nations his enemies, and they would not much longer keep quiet. To the outward eye the French empire looked more splendid than ever; the emperor's last reckless annexation had extended its borders to Lübeck on the one hand and to Rome on the other; his army, in spite of the ever-running "Spanish ulcer," was more numerous, if not more efficient, than ever before. His dynasty seemed assured by the birth of a long-denied son and heir. Yet his power was verging to decay, because he had armed against himself a force even stronger than his own—the general detestation alike of the government and of the nations of Europe.

By 1811 the most powerful of his allies was already showing signs of recalcitrance. The continental system was more noxious to Russia than even to the rest of its victims, for England had always been her best customer. After four years of ruinous compliance with Napoleon's behests, the czar

[1811-1812 A.D.]

Alexander began to kick against the pricks. It was probably the signs of discontent in this quarter which deterred the emperor from setting forth to take up Masséna's unfinished task of "driving the Britannic leopard into the sea." As the year wore on it became more and more clear that he would not go to Spain. No new reinforcements were sent thither, and the last attempts of the French marshals to take the offensive against Wellington were beaten off at Fuentes d'Onoro (May 5th) and Albuera (May 16th). In the next spring it was Wellington who to his adversaries' great surprise suddenly assumed the rôle of invader.

Meanwhile the outlook seemed gloomy enough to the British nation. There were few who could read the signs of the times and foresee the turn of the tide. Many critics railed against the tory government, predicted the final expulsion of Wellington from the peninsula, and pronounced Napoleon invincible. The load of debt seemed heavier than ever; the continental system brought distress, though not ruin, on the manufacturing districts. Bad harvests and low wages oppressed the poor. It was fortunate that the cabinets of Perceval and Lord Liverpool were obstinate and unyielding. Though the greater part of the statesmen of Great Britain were not men of genius, they had firmly grasped the main fact that the struggle was to the death—that there could be no compromise with the enemy—and that all comes to those who wait their opportunity. It was now at hand.

By the end of 1811 the emperor had discovered that if he was determined to enforce the continental system in the drastic fashion which he loved, he would have once more to fight the czar. It was his desire to ruin Britain, therefore, which drove him to Moscow. So obstinate was his will, so unbending his pride, that he did not hesitate to take in hand a new and vast eastern war, while Spain was still unsubdued. The enterprise was too great even for his strength. He gathered the largest army that he had ever yet assembled, six hundred thousand men in all, for the invasion of Russia. But the troops were of very unequal value; nearly half were unwilling foreign auxiliaries who loathed the task; and even the French regiments were no longer their ancient selves: the pick of the old army of Austerlitz and Jena was still detained in Spain.

To meet this vast invading horde the Russians adopted the same tactics which Wellington had used against Masséna in 1810-1811. Instead of fighting on the frontier they retired eastward into the heart of their steppes and forests, leaving the French to starve in a land even poorer and more thinly peopled than Spain itself. The emperor's troops were fast melting away before a combat of importance had been fought. When he reached Borodino, in front of Moscow, where the enemy at last offered battle in an intrenched position, Napoleon had not more than one hundred thousand men with him. The rest were left behind guarding his interminable line of communication, or had died, deserted, or dispersed to plunder. With a last effort and the loss of twenty thousand lives the "grand army" dislodged the Russians from their redoubts (September 7th, 1812), and a few days later entered Moscow. But here, too, Wellington's example had been followed: the city was empty, for the whole civil population had been directed to retire to the east. While Napoleon waited in vain for the czar to ask for peace, a conflagration broke out, and the whole vast city was destroyed. The fire probably had its origin in the carelessness of the French rather than in any incendiary plan of the Russians, but its results served the czar well. Napoleon, deprived of his expected winter quarters, tardily resolved on retreat. But he waited too long, and ere he had gone far on his march was surprised by the bitter winter of

[1812 A.D.]

the steppes. His army, already half starved and more than half demoralised by the obvious failure of the expedition, crumbled away at the touch of the November frost. It dissolved into a mass of marauding stragglers and perished in the snow or fell helpless into the hands of the pursuing Russians. At last Napoleon abandoned his army and fled to Paris to raise new forces. Of the deserted horde only thirty thousand frost-bitten wretches reached the Niemen and took refuge in Germany.

Meanwhile the war in Spain had been almost as disastrous to the French arms as that in Russia. Noting that the armies in front of him were no longer as numerous as before, Wellington suddenly assumed the offensive at the midwinter of 1811-1812, when such a move on the part of such a cautious general was least expected by the enemy. On January, 1812, he stormed Ciudad-Rodrigo, the northern frontier fortress of Spain; in April he captured Badajoz, her southern bulwark; in July he won the battle of Salamanca, and then entered Madrid. If his army had been a little larger he might have expelled the French from the whole of Spain; but when they evacuated Andalusia and all the rest of the south, and united all their surviving forces in a single mass, he was too weak to offer battle. He retired, for the last time, before their advance and took up his old position on the Portuguese frontier. But he had liberated more than half the peninsula by forcing the French to concentrate opposite him. Seville, Cordova, Granada, the Asturias, Estremadura, and La Mancha never saw the eagles again.

Madrid was now the southernmost outpost of King Joseph instead of the centre of his realm. Worse things were yet to come for the usurper: in January, 1813, Napoleon, desperately anxious to get together every man that could be found in order to check the oncoming Russians, sent to Spain for all and more than all of his veterans who could be spared. He withdrew eighty thousand men, leaving the army of occupation not much stronger than the united force of Wellington and the Spaniards. Even he himself must have guessed at the probable consequences in the ensuing campaign. The guerillas were more active than ever; the English had only been checked by the massing of every available man. What must occur when a third of the French army was suddenly withdrawn to Germany?

OUTBREAK OF WAR WITH THE UNITED STATES (1812 A.D.)

It was fortunate for Great Britain that it was in 1812, when the tide had definitely turned, and not at any earlier epoch of the war, that she became engaged in her unhappy and unnecessary struggle with the United States of America. This was one of the indirect results of the continental system, and so far a triumph for Bonaparte's policy; but it came too late to profit him. Seeing their transatlantic commerce strangled by the joint results of the Milan Decrees on one hand, and the British orders in council on the other, the Americans were naturally indignant at the two reckless adversaries who were ruining not only each other, but also the neutrals who wished to take no part in the war. This resentment after a time resulted in their placing an embargo on trade with either power. But matters did not end here: Napoleon was practically unassailable by the United States; Great Britain, on the other hand, was very vulnerable. The vast but thinly peopled colony of Canada was close at hand, a tempting prey, for in the stress of the European war it had been left almost ungarrisoned. An excellent justification for the declaration of hostilities was found in the orders in council of 1807, in the rough exercise of the hated "right of search" which Britain claimed on the high

[1812-1813 A.D.]

seas, and in the frequent seizure from American vessels of British deserters, whose change of nationality the British government refused to recognise. But there would have been no war if the president and his advisers had not been under the impression that Canada might be had for the taking. As far as provocation went, there was quite as good cause for fighting Napoleon.

The delivery of this unexpected attack, "the stab in the back," as a British statesman called it, was followed by none of the results which the two combatants expected. These invasions of Canada were beaten off with loss by the small garrison and the local militia, who even captured whole two small American expeditions; clearly, the colony was not to prove the helpless victim that had been supposed. On the other hand, upon the sea, where no danger had been expected, the British met with unpleasant surprises. On three occasions in the first year of the war the well-manned and efficient American frigates captured in single combat British vessels of very slightly inferior force—a thing which the successors of Nelson held incredible. Moreover, American privateering proved much more costly to the mercantile marine than that of the French or Dutch had ever been. The war thus proved disappointing to each of the combatants, but was destined to endure till the greater struggle in Europe had come to an end.

THE FALL OF NAPOLEON

The year 1813 had proved the rottenness of Napoleon's empire when assailed, for the first time, by all his enemies combined. He had raised by superhuman exertion an army as large as that which he had lost in Russia, but the raw and ill-compacted masses could not fight or manœuvre as their predecessors had done. He held the Russians and Prussians at bay for a space, but when Austria also struck in against him the odds were too great. At the three-days' battle of Leipsic (October 16th-18th, 1813) he lost not only the victory but the greater part of his army. He retired behind the Rhine to rally the wrecks, but with wise promptness his enemies hurried hard upon the track and were assailing him in France ere the new year was many days old.

Nor was it only on the side of the Rhine that Bonaparte saw his frontiers overstepped. Wellington's Spanish campaign of 1813 had exceeded in the brilliance of its results that of the preceding year. He was now at last on equal terms as regards numbers with his adversaries; but they were scattered over the provinces which they still retained, vainly striving to hold down the guerillas. Secretly assembling his army when the spring had arrived, he rushed into the midst of the French cantonments, caught them before they could concentrate, and completely beat their main army at Vittoria (June 21st, 1813). Never was there a more decisive victory; every gun and every wagon belonging to the French army was captured, and the defeated host fled in utter rout into France. By this single blow the whole of northern Spain was liberated, save the two frontier fortresses of Pampeluna and St. Sebastian. During the autumn Wellington captured both, after foiling in the so-called "battles of the Pyrenees" the effort made by Marshal Soult with the rallied French "Army of Spain" to relieve them. He then crossed the Bidassoa and entered France at the head of one hundred thousand men. Such was the ultimate result of Bonaparte's reckless and immoral Spanish policy. It had cost him in the five years 1808-1813 some three hundred thousand good soldiers, and had finally brought an Anglo-Spanish army upon his back, at the moment when he was facing eastward in the desperate endeavour to beat off the in-

[1813-1814 A.D.]

vading hordes of the Austrians, Russians, and Prussians. He himself confessed, during his final year of disasters, that it was the "Spanish ulcer" that had ruined him. But this was only part of the truth: it was far more truly his insane devotion to the continental system that had proved fatal. If he had not maddened all Europe by that ingenious but intolerable scheme, he might have endured much longer the drain caused by the Peninsular War.

But his forces were now used up. Though he made a skilful and desperate defence in Champagne he could not resist fourfold numbers. The allies edged him back, beat his marshals, and finally slipped past him and captured Paris. At the same moment the English had entered Bordeaux, and occupied the southwestern departments of France. The game was up, and on April 7th, 1814, the emperor was forced by his own generals to abdicate. The victorious allies placed on the throne of France the elderly Louis XVIII, the heir of the half-forgotten house of Bourbon, and sent their vanquished foe to Elba, to reign over a barren rock and ten thousand Tuscan peasants.

THE PEACE OF GHENT (1814 A.D.)

It seemed that at last the storm that had been let loose by the outbreak of the French Revolution had run its course. For the first time since the rupture of the Treaty of Amiens the cannon was silent in Europe. Britain alone was at first unable to disarm, for her war with the United States was still in progress. But with the removal of Napoleon and the continental system that war, too, lost its *raison d'être*. The orders in council, the impressment of seamen, the rigid exercise of the right of search disappeared with the fall of the Corsican. There was now little left to fight about; the Americans were as sick of the war as were the British. All their ports were blockaded, their commerce was at an end; of their victorious frigates some had been destroyed by superior forces, the rest were shut up in harbours. The invasion of Canada had brought nothing but disaster. On the other hand, the cabinet of Lord Liverpool had no wish to go on with the struggle: the last episode of the war had showed that even when reinforcements of Wellington's veterans became available for use in America, there was no certainty of success. It was true that one expedition had burned the public buildings of Washington, in revenge for a similar act of vandalism on the part of the United States troops at York, the capital of Upper Canada. But the same troops had failed before Baltimore, and a larger expedition was beaten off with dreadful loss from an attack on New Orleans. Before 1814 was out Britain and the United States had signed the Peace of Ghent, a treaty whose main peculiarity was that it made no mention of any of the disputed points which had been used as the American *casus belli* in 1812 (December 24th, 1814). Thus an unsatisfactory peace ended an unsatisfactory war.

THE END OF NAPOLEON

With the ratification of the Treaty of Ghent it might have been thought that the whole world had settled down to rest—the uneasy rest of exhaustion it might be—but yet one likely to last for a whole generation. Disarmament was already in progress, and the Congress of Vienna was hard at work endeavouring to patch up new boundaries for Europe and to reconcile the various incompatible claims of the victorious allies. In the midst of the wrangling of the diplomats there came terrifying news which caused them to lay aside their grievances and patch up their old league. Napoleon had

[1815 A.D.]

escaped from Elba (March, 1815), had landed in France, and had rallied to his side the whole of his veterans, who were enduring with angry contempt the unsympathetic rule of the restored Bourbons. The French nation was astonished rather than rejoiced at the emperor's reappearance; but the army welcomed him back with enthusiasm. On finding that no one would fire a shot in his behalf, Louis XVIII had once more to seek refuge in exile.

Bonaparte was borne up for a time by the vain hope that he could secure his permanent restoration by making lavish professions of peace, and intriguing to separate the allied powers from one another by appeals to their individual interests. But his adventure was hopeless from the first; his old enemies knew him too well; all eagerly put aside their quarrels for a general crusade against the spectre who had arisen from his grave to disturb the peace of Europe. Bonaparte found that he had to fight for his existence with a very remote chance of survival; for even three victories such as Austerlitz would not now have saved him. But he dashed into the field, anxious to take his enemies in detail before they had begun to concentrate. There is no need to tell at length how his scheme failed; he marched into Belgium with headlong speed, with the design of separating Wellington's English and Blucher's Prussians, the only two armies that were already mobilised. On June 10th he gave the Prussians a heavy blow at Ligny, but failed to destroy or demoralise them. Two days later, while his cavalry were foaming away their strength against the indomitable squares of Wellington's English on the hillside of Mount St. Jean, the Prussians appeared upon his flank and rear. Blucher, far from being disposed of at Ligny, was ready for a second fight. The French army had already exhausted itself in the effort to break Wellington's line; it was hopelessly outnumbered when the Prussians appeared, and the emperor himself could not ward off the inevitable. When the last charge of his guards was beaten off by the British the cry of *Sauve qui peut!* ran round the ranks of the despairing host, and the whole multitude fled headlong for France, hurrying away their despairing master in their midst. Napoleon's restoration had been purely the work of the army; when therefore the army had been crushed he had no hope left. All that he could do was to abdicate for a second time and to surrender himself to the conquerors. This time they would not grant him a second Elba, but sent him away under surveillance to eat out his heart in captivity upon the lonely and wind swept island of St. Helena in the South Atlantic Ocean.

THE STATE OF ENGLAND

The "Napoleonic idea" was disposed of for nearly fifty years, and many European statesmen vainly dreamed that they were permanently quit both of it and of the kindred terror, the red spectre of the Revolution. Those who lived long enough saw their error; but for many years after Waterloo the times were comparatively quiet, and there was a long pause in the political development of modern Europe. Britain therefore had ample time to take stock of the results of the twenty-three eventful years which had passed since the French republic declared war on her in February, 1793. Never before had the whole *morale* of the nation been so profoundly modified in such a short space of time. Both morally and materially the difference between the Britain of 1793 and the Britain of 1815 was enormous. Nine years spent in waging a war of opinions and ideas, and twelve years more spent in fighting for existence and empire, had made her wary, resolute, and far-sighted as she had never been before. Nothing is more striking than the fact

that in the latter years of the great struggle she maintained a wise and courageous and consistent policy without having any statesman of first-rate eminence to guide her. It was the nation that fought down Bonaparte: the successive cabinets which administered affairs were merely carrying out the nation's behest. Faction had died down in a way that would have seemed incredible to an eighteenth-century politician. A bitter enemy of England observed in 1813 that there was no profit to be made by her enemies out of her system of party government; the opposition instead of intriguing to upset ministries confined itself to harmless criticisms of means rather than of ends. There was barely a handful of extreme "whigs," who really tried to do mischief by pretending to persist in the view that Bonaparte was a beneficent being goaded into war by the tories, and prophesying his ultimate triumph. These madmen were utterly without influence in their own party. It was generally felt that the heirs of Pitt must be allowed to finish the war in Pitt's fashion. When the struggle was over, it would be time enough to take in hand the reforms that had long been overdue. The moment that the nation's mandate had been executed, and Bonaparte had been consigned to St. Helena, party politics came to life again; and in the course of the next generation the necessary changes in the constitution were made. If these changes were resisted by the tories, it was because their elder men, whose views had been stereotyped by the contemplation of the French Revolution, instinctively confused reform with Jacobinism, and change with chaos. It is hard to blame them when we consider what they had seen and lived through. At the worst the tory and whig parties of the days after the war were infinitely more honest, patriotic, and respectable than their predecessors of the old days before 1793.

The improvement in politics was only a symptom of the general moral improvement of the nation. The war had sobered Britain; the eighteenth century had been slack in its ideals of public and private virtue, over-tolerant of cynicism and corruption, of shameless evil living and of neglect of obligations. If the war taught the nation that civic virtue and conscientious will to work must be demanded from its leaders, it also required a better general level of life and duty from every man. Even the most frivolous had been shocked by the frightful massacres and the reckless cruelties of the French Revolution. Even the least sensitive had felt the awful stress when in 1797-1798, and again in 1803-1804 a great national catastrophe had seemed imminent. Such crises had bred a certain sobriety and earnestness, a Spartan power of endurance which the eighteenth century had never known.

This was strengthened by a strong religious revival. Even before the revolutionary war broke out, the movement started by Wesley had begun to revive personal religion, which had seemed to slumber so deeply during the times of the earlier Georges. But there can be no doubt that the tendency was developed by the character of the French war. Many men were startled into a more serious view of life by the blasphemous antics of the Parisian freethinkers. The enthronisation of the "Goddess of Reason" on the altar of Notre Dame and the accompanying Saturnalia did more for the cause of religion than a thousand sermons. For the first time since the old parliamentary wars men armed with a crusading spirit against a spiritual enemy; and the cry "for God and the king" had a real meaning when the foe was the atheist republic of France. The student of such themes will find a strong strain of evangelical piety and enthusiasm running through many of the private diaries of the men of the great war—those of the admirals Lord Keith and Lord Collingwood may serve as good instances. Though much

[1792-1815 A.D.]

eighteenth-century frivolity and indifferentism survived into the opening years of the nineteenth century, the general tendency was in the other direction. The detestation in which the prince regent (George IV), a most typical eighteenth-century character, was held by the majority of his subjects, came almost entirely from the revival of personal religion and the sense of social duty and decency among them.

Morally the results of the war were all on the side of improvement. The nation was far more sober, earnest, and efficient for the long time of storm and stress that it had endured. Materially the changes were not all for the better. It is true that the strength and wealth of Great Britain had steadily increased in spite of all hindrances. Its population had gone up from fourteen million to nineteen million souls, in spite of the terrible blood-tax levied throughout the period. Its ordinary revenue had gone up in an even more astonishing fashion: putting aside special war taxation and loans, the taxes which had produced £19,000,000 in 1792 brought in £45,000,000 in 1815. Exports had risen in the same period from £27,000,000 to £58,000,000. Even the crushing load of £900,000,000 of debt proved perfectly bearable when the war ceased. This marvellous prosperity came from the fact that the war, ranging round every corner of the Continent, had ruined Britain's manufacturing rivals. It was to be fifty years before they picked up the lost ground. In a similar way we had absorbed the whole carrying trade of the world. We had destroyed the merchant navies of France, Spain, and Holland, while Bonaparte by his misguided continental system had aided us to garner in the greater part of the commerce of the neutral states. By 1815 Great Britain had achieved not only naval domination but commercial monopoly. Her mastery of the seas was very different from the mere primacy that she had owned among maritime powers in 1792.

Territorially her empire had also developed in the most marked fashion. This was not by conquest from Napoleon and his allies: nothing could have been more modest than the cessions exacted by Great Britain as her share in the spoil distributed by the Congress of Vienna. There was no more than Malta and the Ionian Isles and Heligoland in Europe; St. Lucia, Tobago, and Trinidad in the West Indies; the colony of Demerara in South America; the isles of Ceylon and Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, and the then insignificant settlement of the Cape of Good Hope. Thrice as much was restored to its old owners by the Peace of 1815. On the map the red patches gained in the war look small. Far more important were developments made in other ways: it is to the time of the great French war that belongs the final establishment of British supremacy in India, by Wellesley's conquest of the Maharattas (1803-1804). Equally to this period belongs the establishment of British claims over Australia. The first settlement at Sydney had been made in 1788, just before the French Revolution began; by 1815 the colony was already growing, and the whole continent had been formally annexed, in consequence of Napoleon's threats to claim a part of it during the Peace of Amiens. In a similar way the exploration of the vast hinterland of Canada had been begun, and a permanent settlement planted on the Pacific coast in Vancouver Island, to which the limit of British colonisation was to be extended across the American continent. These advances were far more important than the conquest of any amount of sugar islands or naval outposts from France and her allies.

There was no compensating disadvantage in this commercial development and colonial expansion. But it was quite otherwise with the third great economic feature of the period 1793-1815. This was the so-called "economic

revolution," the transformation of British domestic industry to its modern shape. Down to the second half of the eighteenth century the manufactures of England, though already important, were mere handicrafts unaided by machinery, and scattered over the whole face of the land. A series of mechanical discoveries changed all this. The first of them was that iron could be smelted with coal, a thing unknown before, which made the district of northern England, where coal and iron lie side by side, a great industrial centre instead of a range of barren moors. A few years later came the discoveries of Watt and Arkwright, the former of whom applied steam to the working of machinery, while the latter perfected the details and definitely substituted mechanism for the slowly moving human hand in the spinning and weaving industry. These all-important inventions were well established in England, though still almost unknown abroad, when the revolutionary war broke out. Their development coincided with the years of its progress: all our rivals, being handicapped not only by antiquated methods but by the stress of the French invasions, were hopelessly distanced. Moreover, the sweeping from the seas of all mercantile navies save our own gave us control of all the markets outside Europe. In a single generation British industry supplanted that of other nations in the outer world. The demand for our cheap machine-made manufactures was so great that factories sprang up on every Yorkshire and Lancashire moor, and the population of the north quadrupled itself in thirty years. But the national prosperity was bought at the cost of much individual misery. The classes which had lived by handicrafts were ruined; the new factory hands were ill-paid, huddled together in badly built unsanitary towns of mushroom growth, and often driven to the verge of starvation by the repeated famines which were one of the most unhappy features of the period of the great war. Trades unions were in those days prohibited by law, and the discontent of the industrial population could only vent itself in riots which sometimes almost swelled to the size of insurrections.

This misery was partly artificial, being assisted by the protective tariff on corn which was one of the favourite devices of the tory party. With the object of keeping British farming prosperous they practically excluded foreign corn by heavy duties. But in a time when the growth of population was outrunning the possibilities of home agriculture, protection for the farmer spelt starvation for the factory hand. Repeatedly between 1800 and 1814 the price of wheat rose to over one hundred shillings a quarter—thrice its average price in those days—and whole towns were driven to the edge of starvation. Moreover, the worst of protection was that while it profited the landlord and the farmer, it did not benefit the agricultural labourer, whose wages were kept down by the absurd way in which the "Poor Law" was administered in the reign of George III. The system had been elaborated from a mistaken benevolence, not from any wish to pauperise the labourer, but its effects were to destroy his independence and lower his earnings.

These unhappy economic developments would have ensued even if no French war had been in progress. But it was unfortunate that they came on the scene when the attention of our statesmen was wholly taken up with the continental struggles. Without that distraction it would have been easier to recognise the social evils and to take in hand measures for their palliation. But with Napoleon on our threshold there were few who listened to the clamours within the national edifice. When riots broke out, when Luddites' smashed machinery, or farm labourers burned ricks, the governing classes

[¹ The Luddites, says Aubray,^{*} were "named after a poor idiot who broke some stocking-frames in a frenzy."]

[1792-1815 A.D.]

thought that they were facing Jacobin revolts, instead of the mere explosion of blind multitudes on the edge of starvation. Hence came much oppressive legislation and unsympathetic governance, which aggravated the evils that they could not remove.

The victorious end of the French war solved the problems of empire. It left behind wholly unsolved the domestic problems of Great Britain. The working out of the necessary political, social, and economic reforms was to be the task of the sons of the men who had beaten off the foreign enemy and won the empire of the seas and the pre-eminence in the industrial world.





CHAPTER II

REACTION AND REFORM

[1816-1830 A.D.]

CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY

THE imperial parliament assembled on the 1st of February, 1816. At this opening of the session the ministry met the representatives of the people with all the pride and confidence of a success beyond hope. The march to Paris, twice over, says Brougham,^b was sufficiently marvellous; "but it appeared, if possible, still more incredible that we should witness Lord Castlereagh entering the house of commons, and resuming, amidst universal shouts of applause, the seat which he had quitted for a season to attend as a chief actor in the arrangement of continental territory." Why incredible? Lord Castlereagh in the house of commons was the impersonation of a great national triumph. The parliamentary majority cheered the minister for foreign affairs as he would have been cheered by any other assembly, when he came home flushed with success. For a little while the nation might bear even the presumption of those who claimed all the merit of the triumph. On the first night of the session it was clearly seen that there was to be a limit to what parliament would bear. The chancellor of the exchequer declared his intention to continue the property or income tax on the modified scale of 5 per cent. This avowal was the signal for one of the chief battle-cries which were to lead on the scanty forces of opposition.

In a debate in the committee of supply, Lord Castlereagh used a memorable expression which roused a spirit in the country of deep hostility—almost of disgust: "He felt assured that the people of England would not, from an ignorant impatience to be relieved from the pressure of taxation, put everything to hazard, when everything might be accomplished by continued constancy and firmness." From the moment of this offensive declaration the income tax was doomed. The people had not borne the taxation of so

[1816 A.D.]

many years of war with a heroism such as no people had ever before shown, to be taunted with ignorant impatience of taxation, now that they had won peace. The presumption of the government at this period was calculated to produce a violent reaction throughout the land. Men really thought that the old English spirit of freedom was about to be trampled upon when the debates on the treaties took place, in which Lord Liverpool moved the address. Lord Grenville proposed an amendment, which deprecated in the strongest language "the settled system to raise the country into a military power." In the house of peers the government had a majority of sixty-four. Lord Holland entered a protest against the address, in terms which embodied his speech upon the treaties, and expressed the opinions of that section of the opposition: "Because the treaties and engagements contain a direct guarantee of the present government of France against the people of that country; and, in my judgment, imply a general and perpetual guarantee of all European governments against the governed." In the house of commons the foreign secretary moved the address upon the treaties. An amendment was proposed by Lord Milton, which deprecated the military occupation of France and the unexampled military establishments of this country. The debate lasted two nights, the address being finally carried by a majority of 163.

The corporation of London took the lead in the national expression of opinion against the property tax. It was not only the anti-ministerial party of the city that joined in the petition of the corporation;—the judgments of mercantile men against the continuance of the tax were almost universal.

The inquisitorial character of the property tax had some influence in producing the popular hostility to its continuance. The returns of the taxpayers were then scrutinised with a severity which has been wisely put aside in the present times. But during the pressure of war expenditure, and long afterwards, the imposition and collection of other taxes were rendered as odious as possible to the people. The government employed, to an extent which scarcely seems credible now, an army of common informers, through whose agency the system of surcharges and penalties was enforced. Southey^o attacked this disgrace of our nation as being ten times more inquisitorial than the Holy Office of Spain. "This species of espionage has within these few years become a regular trade; the laws are in some instances so perplexing, and in others so vexatious, that matter for prosecution is never wanting." He describes how "a fellow surcharges half the people in the district; that is, he informs the tax commissioners that such persons have given in a false account of their windows, dogs, horses, carriages, etc., an offence for which the tax is trebled, and half the surplus given to the informer." Harassed and perplexed—summoned from distant parts to appear before the commissioners—the persons informed against give up the trouble and expense of seeking justice; pay the penalty and bear the surcharge.

The debates upon the army estimates, which eventually caused some reduction—the rejection of the property tax—the searching inquiry into the civil list—the agitation of the question of sinecure offices—were indications of the feeling which any government would have to encounter that did not resolutely determine that a season of peace should be a season of economy. When the details of the civil list exhibited items of wanton and ridiculous luxury, the members of the administration themselves were pained and humiliated. When the same ministers proposed the magnificent establishment for the princess Charlotte and Prince Leopold, upon their marriage,

[^o Parliamentary speeches are usually quoted from Hansard's *Debates* throughout this chapter.]

[1816 A.D.]

not a dissenting voice was heard in parliament. The nation saw in this marriage of the presumptive heiress of the crown—a marriage of affection—some assured hope that public duties might be fitly learned in the serenity of domestic happiness. The private virtues were felt to be the best preparation for the possession of sovereign power. The idea of a patriot queen discharging all her high functions with steady alacrity, confident in the affections of her people, of simple habits, of refined and intellectual tastes, her throne sanctified by the attributes of womanly affection—such hopes were something to console the nation for the present endurance of authority that claimed only “mouth-honour,” without love or respect. The marriage of the princess Charlotte took place at Carlton House, on the evening of the 2nd of May.

When the government, in the name of the prince regent, informed parliament that “the manufactures, commerce, and revenue of the United Kingdom were in a flourishing condition,” the exception of agriculture was a sufficient announcement that the cry of “distress” was near at hand. Amidst the best and the worst species of opposition—the power of argument and the weakness of tumult—a bill was in 1815 hurried through parliament which absolutely closed the ports till the price of wheat rose to 80s. This law was passed during a season of wonderful abundance. It produced the immediate good to the landed interest of preventing the abundant supply being increased by importation; but the effect which it produced to the nation was to dry up the resources in years of scarcity which the foresight of other countries might have provided. The war-and-famine price of 1812 was again reached in the latter part of 1816, in 1817, and in 1818. The golden days of the deity that is found in no mythology, the Anti-Ceres, were returned. But the people were starving. Misery and insurrection filled the land.

A year after the hasty enactment of a corn law in 1815, amidst riots in the metropolis and the provinces, a majority of the landed interest came to parliament to ask for the remission of peculiar burdens, and to demand fresh protection. The landed interest of 1816 had but one remedy for every evil—unequal remission of taxation conjoined with protection. They desired themselves to pay less to the state than their fellow subjects. They required the state to limit their fellow subjects to that exclusive market for the necessities of life which should dry up the sources of profitable industry, and thus make their taxation doubly burdensome. On the 7th of March Mr. Western laid upon the table of the house a series of fourteen resolutions, which declared the “unexampled distress” of those whose capitals were employed in agriculture. They demanded the repeal of so much of the Act of 1815 as should allow foreign corn to be warehoused, so that only British corn should be stored; and urged an advance of money by the government to such individuals as might be inclined to buy up our native produce. The principle upon which all this was advocated was a sufficiently broad one: “That excessive taxation renders it necessary to give protection to all articles the produce of our own soil, against similar articles the growth of foreign countries, not subject to the same burdens”; and “that it is therefore expedient to impose additional duties and restrictions on the importation of all articles, the produce of foreign agriculture.” The resolutions of Mr. Western in 1816 came to no practical result; for the chief reason that the forced abandonment of the property tax, and the voluntary relinquishment of the war malt duty, had really left very little within the reach of government to be offered as a further boon to the landed interest.

“Manufactures and commerce,” said the speech of the prince regent, “are in a flourishing condition.” This was to rely upon the bare figures of

[1816 A.D.]

custom-house returns. In 1815 the declared value of British and Irish produce and manufactures exported was £51,000,000, being £6,000,000 more than in 1814. Well might the commerce of the country seem to be flourishing. Those who knew the real workings of that commerce were not so deceived. Mr. Baring, on the second night of the session, declared, that "he saw more loss than gain in this great increase of export." When the destruction of the power of Napoleon in 1814 had opened the ports of the Continent to our vessels, when the consumption of our exports no longer depended upon a vast system of contraband trade; it was universally thought that there could be no limit to the demand for British manufactures and colonial produce. If, under the anti-commercial decrees of our great enemy the shipments to European ports had been £12,000,000 in 1811, why should they not be doubled in 1814? And accordingly they were doubled. The most extravagant profits were expected to be realised. The ordinary course of trade was forsaken, and small capitalists as well as large, at the outports as well as in London, eagerly bought up colonial produce, and looked for golden returns. "The shippers found to their cost, when it was too late," says Tooke,^d "that the effective demand on the Continent for colonial produce and British manufactures had been greatly overrated; for whatever might be the desire of the foreign consumers to possess articles so long out of their reach, they were limited in their means of purchase, and accordingly, the bulk of the commodities exported brought very inadequate returns."

The state of the American trade of 1816 was described by Mr. Brougham,^b after speaking of the disastrous results of the continental speculations:—"The peace with America has produced somewhat of a similar effect; though I am very far from placing the vast exports which it occasioned upon the same footing with those of the European markets the year before; because ultimately the Americans will pay; which the exhausted state of the Continent renders very unlikely." Let us remark that we did not prevent the Americans paying in the only way in which one great people can pay another—by the interchange of commodities which each wants, in return for commodities of which each can produce a superfluity. We shut out their corn, but we did not shut out their cotton. But we went farther with the United States in the recognition of just commercial principles than with any European nation. By the Treaty of Ghent, in 1814, both countries agreed to repeal their navigation laws, and "the ships of the two countries were placed reciprocally upon the same footing in the ports of England and the United States, and all discriminating duties chargeable upon the goods which they conveyed were mutually repealed."

The distresses of the agricultural and the commercial interests were coincident; for the means of purchase amongst all classes were exhausted. The capital which was to impel their profitable industry was dried up. There was, says Tooke,^d "a very general depression in the prices of nearly all productions, and in the value of all fixed property, entailing a convergence of losses and failures among the agricultural, and commercial, and manufacturing, and mining, and shipping, and building interests, which marked that period as one of most extensive suffering and distress."

The Luddite insurrection of 1812 had never been wholly put down. In 1816 it broke forth with new violence. At Loughborough, in July, many frames employed in the manufacture of lace were destroyed with the same secrecy as in 1812. Armed bands, under the orders of a chief, held the inhabitants in nightly terror, commanding them to put out their lights, and keep within their houses, under penalty of death. Their ravages were not

[1816 A.D.]

confined to the towns; they would march with suddenness and secrecy to distant villages, and rapidly effect their purposes of destruction. The general Ludd, who led on these armed and disguised desperadoes, would address his forces in a short speech, divide them into parties, and assign their respective operations. Then, in the silence of night, would houses and factories be broken open, frames and other machines be demolished, unfinished work be scattered on the highways, furniture be wholly destroyed. The ignorance which has more or less prevailed at all times on the subject of machinery—coupled with the want of employment produced by the depression of every branch of industry—was the cause that, undeterred by the terrible penalties of the law, the Luddites still pursued the course which had well-nigh driven the lace manufacturers from the district, and converted temporary distress into permanent ruin.

REFORMS IN THE CRIMINAL LAW

The notion that had been engendered by the French Revolution that to innovate was to destroy, that to reform was to revolutionise, was the creed of the majority from the close of the war to the end of the reign of George IV. The reaction, which in 1816 had commenced, of a more enlightened public opinion, finally produced the remarkable progress in social improvement which is the great characteristic of the happier eras of William IV and of Victoria. This reaction acquired efficiency and permanence from the very obstinacy with which it was resisted. It grew up during an incessant conflict, in which the roughest weapons of controversy were freely used by speakers and by writers. The amount of acrimony and intolerance which we may trace in the periodical press of that time, now appears ludicrous to the few who have survived what Sydney Smith calls "an awful period for those who had the misfortune to entertain liberal opinions." A later generation turns with loathing from the mode in which educated men denounced those who differed from them in the notion that the English constitution, as then understood, was the best possible form of government, and that what those who were sneered at as enthusiasts called social evils were really blessings in disguise. When the enthusiasts attempted to repeal or modify laws wholly unsuited to the advanced opinions of the age, and which appeared unlikely to provoke the hostility of mere selfish interests, there was always some formidable adversary to stand in the breach, ready to defend the crumbling outer walls of our time-honoured institutions, as if they constituted the strength and glory of the citadel.

Romilly was the foremost amongst the courageous spirits who risked something for the amelioration of the lot of their fellow men. His perseverance was an example to other earnest labourers, who, amidst much suspicion, and some ridicule, rested not till they had secured a neutral ground on which the benevolent and wise of each party might labour without any compromise of their political consistency. Criminal laws; police; poor laws; education; these offered themselves, when the excitement of the war had passed away, as subjects that might be dealt with in the same spirit which had finally carried the abolition of the slave trade. Tory might unite with whig in measures whose necessity was proclaimed in many forms of misery, of oppression, of neglect. Resistance to change gradually became feebler and feebler. There was a wide gulf between the land of promise and the land of reality; but it was first bridged over with a single plank, and then a solid structure arose, across which the advocates of "things as they should

[1816 A.D.]

be" securely passed to an enduring triumph, of which the wisest of the adherents of "things as they are" came, in the fulness of time, to share the honour.

The name of reform in the criminal laws had not been heard in the house of commons for fifty-eight years, when, in 1808, Romilly carried his bill for the abolition of the punishment of death for privately stealing from the person to the value of five shillings; in other words, for picking pockets. His friend Scarlett advised him to attempt at once to repeal all the statutes which punish with death mere thefts unaccompanied by any act of violence, or other circumstance of aggravation; but Romilly, seeing that he had no chance of being able to carry through the house a bill which was to expunge at once all those laws from the statute-book, determined to attempt the repeal of them one by one. Upon this prudential principle Romilly carried his first reform in 1808. Nevertheless, the house of commons, which consented to pass the bill, forced upon him the omission of its preamble:—"Whereas, the extreme severity of penal laws hath not been found effectual for the prevention of crimes; but, on the contrary, by increasing the difficulty of convicting offenders, in some cases affords them impunity, and in most cases renders their punishment extremely uncertain." The temper with which too many persons of rank and influence received any project of amelioration at the beginning of this century is forcibly exhibited in an anecdote which Romilly^e has preserved for our edification. The brother of a peer of the realm, fresh from a debauch, came up to him at the bar of the house of commons, and stammered out, "I am against your bill; I am for hanging all."

In 1810 Romilly brought in three bills to repeal the acts which punished with death the crimes of stealing privately in a shop goods of the value of five shillings, and of stealing to the amount of forty shillings in a dwelling house, or on board vessels in navigable rivers. The first bill passed the house of commons, but was lost in the lords. The other two were rejected. In 1811 the rejected bills were again introduced, with a fourth bill, abolishing the capital punishment for stealing in bleaching grounds. The four bills were carried through the house of commons; but only that on the subject of bleaching grounds was sanctioned by the lords. The constant argument that was employed on these occasions against the alteration of the law was this—that of late years the offences which they undertook to repress were greatly increased. Justly did Romilly say, "A better reason than this for altering the law could hardly be given." On the 24th of May, 1811, when three of the bills were rejected in the house of lords, Lord Ellenborough declared, "They went to alter those laws which a century had proved to be necessary, and which were now to be overturned by speculation and modern philosophy." The lord chancellor, Eldon, on the same occasion stated that he had himself early in life felt a disposition to examine the principles on which our criminal code was framed, "before observation and experience had matured his judgment. Since, however, he had learned to listen to these great teachers in this important science, his ideas had greatly changed, and he saw the wisdom of the principles and practice by which our criminal code was regulated." In 1813 Sir Samuel Romilly's bill for the abolition of capital punishment in cases of shoplifting was carried by the commons in the new parliament; but it was again rejected in the house of lords. No further attempt was made towards the amelioration of this branch of the laws till the year 1816.

On the 16th of February Sir Samuel Romilly obtained leave to bring in a bill repealing the act of William the Third, which made it a capital offence to steal privately in a shop to the value of five shillings. He described this act as

[1816 A.D.]

the most severe and sanguinary in our statute book. As recently as 1785 no less than ninety-seven persons were executed in London for this offence alone; and the dreadful spectacle was exhibited of twenty suffering at the same time. The capital sentence was now constantly evaded by juries committing a pious fraud, and finding the property of less value than was required by the statute. The consequence, if severe laws were never executed, was, that crime went on to increase, and the crimes of juvenile offenders especially. On moving the third reading of the bill, on the 15th of March, Sir Samuel Romilly called attention to the great number of persons of very tender age who had recently been sentenced to death for pilfering in shops. At that moment there was a child in Newgate, not ten years of age, under sentence of death for this offence; and the recorder of London was reported to have declared that it was intended to enforce the laws strictly in future, to interpose some check, if possible, to the increase of youthful depravity. The bill passed the commons, but was thrown out in the lords on the 22nd of May. On this occasion the lord chief justice agreed with the lord chancellor, "that the effect of removing the penalty of death from other crimes had rendered him still more averse to any new experiment of this kind. Since the removal of the vague terror which hung over the crime of stealing from the person, the number of offences of that kind had alarmingly increased." Thus, with the absolute certainty of experience that bloody laws vigorously administered did not diminish crime, the legislators of the beginning of the nineteenth century believed, or affected to believe, that the same laws scarcely ever carried into execution would operate through the influence of what they called "a vague terror." The inefficiency of this system is forcibly demonstrated by a comparison of the number of forged notes presented at the Bank of England, with the number of persons convicted of forging and uttering such notes, and the number of these executed for forgery. In 1816 there were 17,885 forged notes presented at the Bank of England; 104 persons were convicted of forgery; 18 were executed. The capital punishment for forgery was not abolished till 1833; but there was no execution for that offence after 1829. The crime had decreased by removing the temptation to its perpetration upon a large scale. In 1820 there were 29,035 forged notes presented at the bank; the convictions were 352; the executions were 21. In 1823 the forged notes presented were 1,648; the convictions were 6; the executions were 2. The resumption of cash payments had extinguished the notes for one pound and two pounds, which had previously constituted the chief circulating medium.

THE POLICE OF LONDON

In 1816 our system of police had arrived at its perfection of imbecile wickedness. The machinery for the prevention and detection of crime was exactly accommodated to the machinery for its punishment. On the 3rd of April, on the motion of Mr. Bennet, a committee of the house of commons was appointed to inquire into the state of the police of the metropolis. The committee was resumed in 1817; and two reports were presented, which were among the first causes of the awakening of the public mind to a sense of the frightful evils which were existing in what we flattered ourselves to be the most civilised city in the world. There was no unity of action amongst the petty jurisdictions into which the metropolis was divided. The notion of a preventive police was utterly unknown. The "thief-taker," as the police officer was called, was the great encourager of crime. The suppression of

[1816 A.D.]

crime would have taken away the chief profits of his occupation. Flash-houses, known in the scientific phraseology of the police as "flash-cribs," "shades," and "infernals," were filthy dens, where thieves and abandoned females were always to be found, riotous or drowsy, surrounded by children of all ages, qualifying for their degrees in the college of crime. "There," says a Middlesex magistrate, examined before the committee of 1816, "they (the children) see thieves and thief-takers sitting and drinking together on terms of good fellowship; all they see and hear is calculated to make them believe they may rob without fear of punishment, for in their thoughtless course they do not reflect that the forbearance of the officers will continue no longer than until they commit a forty-pound crime, when they will be sacrificed." A forty-pound crime!—the phraseology is as obsolete as if it were written in the pedlar's French of the rogues of the sixteenth century. A forty-pound crime was a crime for whose detection the state adjudged a reward, to be paid on conviction, of forty pounds; and, as a necessary consequence, the whole race of thieves were fostered into a steady advance from small offences to great, till they obligingly ventured upon some deed of more than common atrocity, which should bestow the blood-money upon the officers of the law who had so long petted and protected them. The system received a fatal blow in 1816, in the detection of three officers of the police, who had actually conspired to induce five men to commit a burglary for the purpose of obtaining the rewards upon their conviction. The highwaymen who infested the suburbs of the metropolis had been eradicated—they belonged to another age. Offences against the person were very rarely connected with any offences against property. But the uncertainty of punishment, the authorised toleration of small offenders, and the organised system of negotiation for the return of stolen property, had filled the metropolis with legions of experienced depredators. The public exhibitions of the most profligate indecency and brutality can scarcely be believed by those who have grown up in a different state of society. When Defoe described his Colonel Jack, in the days of his boyish initiation into vice, sleeping with other children amidst the kilns and glasshouses of the London fields, we read of a state of things that has long passed away. But, as recently as 1816, in Covent Garden market, and other places affording a partial shelter, hundreds of men and women, boys and girls, assembled together, and continued during the night in a state of shameless profligacy, which is described as presenting a scene of vice and tumult more atrocious than anything exhibited even by the lazzaroni of Naples.

The brilliantly lighted, carefully watched, safe, orderly, and tranquil London of the present day presents as great a contrast to the London of 1816, as that, again, contrasted with the London of 1762, the year in which the Westminster Paving and Lighting Act was passed. Street robberies before that period were the ordinary events of the night. Security was the exception to the course of atrocity, for which the government applied no remedy but to hang. For half a century after this the metropolis had its comparative safety of feeble oil-lamps and decrepit watchmen. The streets were filled with tumultuous vagabonds; and the drowsy guardians of the night suffered every abomination to go on in lawless vigour, happy if their sleep were undisturbed by the midnight row of the drunken rake. In 1807 Pall Mall was lighted by gas. The persevering German who spent his own money and that of subscribers to his scheme had no reward. The original gas company, whose example was to be followed, not only by all England but by the whole civilised world, was first derided, and then treated in parliament as rapacious

monopolists, intent upon the ruin of established industry. The adventurers in gaslight did more for the prevention of crime than the government had done since the days of Alfred.

PAUPERISM; POOR-LAW REFORM

A committee of the house of commons was appointed in 1815 to inquire into the state of mendicity and vagrancy in the metropolis and its neighbourhood; and they continued their sittings in 1816, reporting minutes of the evidence in each year. Beyond these reports no legislative measure was adopted. The evidence went rather to show the amount of imposture than of destitution. To collect such evidence was an amusing occupation for the idle mornings of members of parliament. To inquire into the causes of destitution and its remedies would have been a far heavier task. The chief tendency of the evidence was to show how the sturdy beggar was a capitalist and an epicure; ate fowls and beefsteaks for supper, and despised broken meat; had money in the funds, and left handsome legacies to his relations. The witnesses, moreover, had famous stories of a lame impostor who tied up his leg in a wooden frame, and a blind one who wrote letters in the evening for his unlettered brethren; of a widow who sat for ten years with twins who never grew bigger, and a wife who obtained clothes and money from eleven lying-in societies in the same year. But the committee had also some glimpses of real wretchedness amidst these exciting tales of beggar-craft—as old as the days of the old Abraham men. They heard of Calmel's Buildings, a small court of twenty-four houses in the immediate vicinity of Portman square, where more than seven hundred Irish lived in the most complete distress and profligacy; and they were told that the court was totally neglected by the parish; that it was never cleaned; that people were afraid to enter it from dread of contagion. In George Yard, Whitechapel, they were informed that there were two thousand people, occupying forty houses, in a similar state of wretchedness. Much more of this was told the committee; but the evil was exhibited and forgotten. Legislation for public health was unknown till 1848, except in the old laws of quarantine. Very much of what was called the vagrancy of the metropolis was a natural consequence of the administration of the Poor Laws throughout the kingdom. A large proportion of the money raised for the relief of the poor was expended in shifting the burden of their relief from one parish to another; and Middlesex kept a number of functionaries in active operation to get rid of the vagrants that crowded into London, by passing them out of the limits of the metropolitan county, to return, of course, on the first convenient occasion. As Middlesex worked under the law of settlement, so worked the whole kingdom. An intelligent foreigner,¹ who travelled in England in 1810, saw how the poor were repulsed from one parish to another “like infected persons. They are sent back from one end of the kingdom to the other, as criminals formerly in France, *de brigade en brigade*. You meet on the high-roads, I will not say often but too often, an old man on foot with his little bundle—a helpless widow, pregnant perhaps, and two or three barefooted children following her—become paupers in a place where they had not yet acquired a legal right to assistance, and sent away on that account to their original place of settlement.” This law of settlement was in full operation, playing its fantastic tricks from the channel to the Tweed, when the peace filled the land with disbanded seamen and other servants of war; and agricultural labourers, who could find no employ at home, were wandering, as it was called, to search for capital in some unknown region

[1816 A. D.]

where capital was seeking for labour. The statute of 1662, the foundation of the law of settlement, forbade this wandering, and gave a very amusing explanation of the ground of its prohibitions: "Whereas, by reason of some defects in the law, poor people are not restrained from going from one parish to another, and therefore do endeavour to settle themselves in those parishes where there is the best stock." The great natural law of labour seeking exchange with capital was to be resisted by a law which declared that those who sought to effect this exchange were "rogues and vagabonds." In this spirit agricultural parishes very generally came to the resolution of employing none but their own parishioners. "The immediate consequence of this determination was the removal of numbers of the most industrious families from homes where they had lived in comfort and without parish relief all their lives to a workhouse in the parish to which they belonged."

On the 28th of May Mr. Curwen, an intelligent agriculturist, brought the subject of the Poor Laws before the house of commons on a motion for the appointment of a committee of inquiry. Mr. Curwen had a plan—as many others had their plans. His scheme formed small part of the deliberations of the committee, which reported in 1817. Their recommendations for the remedy of the enormous evil of the existing Poor Laws did not penetrate beneath the surface. In 1816 the amount of poor rate levied was £6,937,425. This charge was at the rate of 12s. 4½d. per head upon the population of England and Wales. The average annual expenditure for the relief of the poor had gradually increased from about two millions at the commencement of the war to seven millions at its close. A very large portion of the money that had been spent in fostering pauperism during the war years, by parish allowances in aid of wages, represents the amount of degradation and misery which the labourers endured, as compared with their unallowanced forefathers. The national debt represents in a great degree the money expended in unprofitable wars—the waste of capital upon objects that can only be justified by the last necessity, and which are the result of those evil passions which the improved knowledge and virtue of mankind may in time root out. In the same way, had the money expended upon fostering pauperism been raised upon loan, we should have had an amount of some two hundred millions, representing, in a like degree, the waste of capital expended in drying up the sources of industry and skill, and paying the alms of miserable indigence instead of the wages of contented labour. It is difficult to conceive a more complete state of degradation than the allowanced labourers exhibited in 1816. With the feudal servitude had passed away the feudal protection. The parish servitude imposed the miseries and contumelies of slavery, without its exemption from immediate care and future responsibility. The old workhouse system was as productive of evil in principle, though not in amount, as the allowance system. In the parish workhouses the consequences of want of classification and bad management operated with the greatest hardship upon children. Habits were formed in the workhouse which rendered the path to respectability almost inaccessible. These children were disposed of under the apprenticing system, and were doomed to a dreary period of servitude under some needy master who had been tempted in the first instance to take them by the offer of a small premium. The parochial plan of putting out children, with its attendant evils, was a necessary consequence of the want of training while in the workhouse.

In 1807 Mr. Whitbread proposed to the house of commons a very large and comprehensive measure of Poor-law reform. The principles which he advocated were those of real statesmanship. To arrest the constant progress

[1816 A.D.]

of pauperism, he desired to raise the character of the labouring classes. He called upon the country to support a plan of general national education; he proposed a method under which the savings of the poor might be properly invested in a great national bank. At the period when Mr. Whitbread brought forward his plan of Poor-law reform, the system of mutual instruction, introduced by Lancaster and Bell, was attracting great attention. Too much importance was perhaps at first attached to the mechanical means of education then recently developed; but the influence was favourable to the establishment of schools by societies and individuals. The government left the instruction of the people to go on as it might, without a single grant, for more than a quarter of a century.

EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE: REFORMS

From 1807 to the close of the war the legislature heard no word on the education of the people. The man who for forty-five years devoted much of his untiring energy to this great question had in 1816 come back to the place in the councils of the nation which he won in 1812 by a combination of industry and talent almost unprecedented. Henry Brougham had not been in parliament for three years. On the 21st of May, 1816, he moved for the appointment of a select committee "to inquire into the state of the education of the lower orders of the people in London, Westminster, and Southwark." The motion, which was brought forward with great caution by the mover, was unopposed. The committee made its first report on the 20th of June, having conducted its inquiries with more than usual activity. The energy of Mr. Brougham, who acted as chairman, gave a remarkable impulse to this important investigation. It was found that in the metropolis there were a hundred and twenty thousand children without the means of education. The principal labours of the committee had consisted in their examination of evidence as to the number and condition of the charity and parish schools destined for the education of the lower orders. The number of such institutions exceeded anything that could have been previously believed; but the expenditure of the funds was in many cases neither pure nor judicious. A few were educated and brought up—the many were neglected. In the country, instances of flagrant abuses had been heard of. Mr. Brougham's report produced no hostile feelings on this occasion. In 1818 the powers of inquiry granted to the committee were no longer confined to the metropolis. Then the larger question of the extension of education was merged in a furious controversy as to the amount of abuses in endowed charities, and the propriety of subjecting the higher schools, such as Eton and Winchester, and also colleges in the universities, to a searching inquiry into the nature of their statutes, and their adherence to the objects of their foundation. An act was subsequently passed, in consequence of the labours of the committee, to appoint commissioners to inquire concerning the abuse of charities connected with education; and by the second act the right of inquiry was extended to all charities, the universities and certain great foundation schools excepted.

The education commission was thus merged in the charity commission. Of the great national benefits that resulted from that commission no one can doubt. But it may be doubted whether the controversial shape which the question of education assumed in 1818 did much to advance the disposition which prevailed in 1816 to provide a general system of popular instruction. From some unhappy prejudice—from apathy or from cowardice

[1816 A.D.]

—the education of the people made small legislative progress for twenty years. Perhaps the old fable of the sun and the wind experimenting upon the removal of the traveller's cloak may afford us some solution of this problem. But the reports of the education committee were of the highest value in showing us the extent of instruction at the time of its labours. There were 18,500 schools, educating 644,000 children; of this number 166,000 were educated at endowed schools, and 478,000 at unendowed schools, during six days of the week. This number was independent of Sunday-schools, of which there were 5,100, attended by 452,000 children; but, of course, many of these Sunday scholars were included in the returns of other schools.

In the plan of Poor-law reform brought forward by Mr. Whitbread in 1807, he earnestly advocated the consideration of a mode by which the savings of the poor might be safely and profitably invested. Three or four years previous Mr. Malthus, in his *Essay on Population*,² had argued that "it might be extremely useful to have county banks, where the smallest sums would be received and a fair interest granted for them." Mr. George Rose had, as early as 1793, legislated for the encouragement of friendly societies. In 1798 a bank for the earnings of poor children was established at Tottenham; and this was found so successful that a bank for the safe deposit of the savings of servants, labourers, and others was opened at the same place in 1804. Interest was here allowed to the depositors. A similar institution was founded at Bath in 1808. But the greatest experiment upon the possibility of the labouring poor making considerable savings was tried in Scotland. "The Parish Bank Friendly Society of Ruthwell" was established by the Rev. Henry Duncan in 1810. The first London savings-bank did not commence its operations till January, 1816. In the parliamentary session of 1816 Mr. Rose brought in a bill for the regulation of savings-banks, which was subsequently withdrawn for revision. Of the possible benefits of these institutions there could be no doubt in the minds of all men who were anxious to improve the condition of the people. "What a bubble!" wrote Cobbett.

In the session of 1816 one step was made towards some improvement of that code which Blackstone termed "a bastard slip of the old forest laws; both productive of the same tyranny to the commons, but with this difference, that the forest laws established only one mighty hunter throughout the land; the game laws have raised a little Nimrod in every manor." The attention of the house of commons was called to this subject in consequence of the murder of Colonel Berkeley's gamekeeper by a gang of armed poachers; and a committee was appointed "to take into consideration the laws relating to game."¹ They came to the resolution "that it is the opinion of this committee, that all game should be the property of the person upon whose lands such game should be found." They contemplated the removal of the qualification to kill game—that law which had its beginning in the reign of Richard II, and which, perfected by the aristocratic legislators of the time of Charles II, required "fifty times the property to enable a man to kill a partridge as to vote for a knight of the shire." The committee of 1816 evidently pointed to the necessity of "removing the restraints upon the sale of game." It was not till after fifteen years of controversy that the statute of William IV dispensed with the qualification for killing game, and legalised its sale. The statute of the 9th of George IV, and that of William IV, rendered the law more stringent and effective against poaching, especially by night. The number of convictions under the acts for the preservation of game furnish no uncertain test, not only of the state of morals amongst the agricultural labourers, but of the presence or absence of those qualities which make the landed proprietor a

[1816 A.D.]

blessing or a curse to his humble neighbours. In the more daring and depraved of the population of the rural districts, the severe administration of the game laws produced a spirit such as was displayed in January, 1816, by the Berkeley poachers, who cried out, "Glory! glory!" when they had killed one game-keeper and wounded six others.

THE WRITINGS OF COBBETT

The call for parliamentary reform seems to have made itself very feebly heard in the lower house in the session of 1816. With the exception of some four or five petitions that produced very slight discussion it would scarcely be thought, from an inspection of the parliamentary debates, that such a question agitated any part of the nation at all. On one occasion, in June, some members spoke very briefly upon the subject. One complained of the apathy with which the question was regarded in England; another (Mr. Brougham) mentioned the cause as "opposed by some, deserted by others, and espoused by persons whose conduct excited no small degree of disgust out of doors." But from this time the name of parliamentary reform became, for the most part, a name of terror to the government—to the elevated by rank and wealth—to the most influential of the middle classes. It became fearful from the causes which would have made it contemptible in ordinary times. It was "espoused by persons whose conduct excited no small degree of disgust out of doors." It passed away from the patronage of a few aristocratic lovers of popularity, to be advocated by writers of "twopenny trash," and to be discussed and organised by "Hampden clubs" of hungering philanthropists and unemployed "weaver boys." Samuel Bamford⁹ says, "At this time the writings of William Cobbett suddenly became of great authority; they were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts. Their influence was speedily visible."

Cobbett advocated parliamentary reform as the corrective of whatever miseries the lower classes suffered. A new order of politicians was called into action. "The Sunday-schools of the preceding thirty years" (says Bamford) had produced many working-men of sufficient talent to become readers, writers, and speakers in the village meetings for parliamentary reform; some also were found to possess a rude poetic talent, which rendered their effusions popular, and bestowed an additional charm on their assemblages; and by such various means, anxious listeners at first, and then zealous proselytes, were drawn from the cottages of quiet nooks and dingles, to the weekly readings and discussions of the Hampden clubs." But let it be remembered, that though the Sunday-schools of the preceding thirty years had made some working-men readers, writers, and speakers, the mass of the labouring population were in the lowest state of ignorance, and were consequently ready to accept the crude and violent opinions of a few of their own class as the only true maxims of political action. The speakers at the village meetings echoed the strong words of Cobbett, without the qualifying prudence which generally kept that master of our language pretty safe in argument and phraseology. He was not the man to tempt a prosecution by a rash sentence that could have been construed into sedition.

Up to the 2nd of November, 1816, *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register* was a publication not addressed to the "cottage hearth," but to persons who could afford to pay a shilling and a halfpenny weekly for a single octavo stamped sheet, printed in open type. His writings, singularly clear and argumentative, strong in personalities, earnest, bold, never halting between

[1816-1817 A.D.]

two opinions, powerful beyond all anonymous writing from their rare individuality, would have commanded an extensive influence under any form of publication. But at the beginning of November, he announced his intention to print *The Twopenny Register*. We see, therefore, why, at the end of 1816, "the writings of William Cobbett suddenly became of great authority, and were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts." Never before had any single writer in England wielded such a power. That his cheap *Registers* gave the discontent of the labouring classes a new direction cannot be doubted; that they did much to repress riot and outrage may fairly be conceded. But that they were scattering the seeds of a greater danger than the outrage and plunder of infuriated mobs cannot be denied. Their object was suddenly to raise up the great masses of labourers and mechanics into active politicians; to render the most impatient and uncontrollable materials of our social system the most preponderating. The danger was evident; the means of repression were not so clear. The effect of Cobbett's writings may be estimated by the violence of his opponents, as well as by the admiration of his disciples. From the date of his *twopenny Registers* he was stigmatised as a "firebrand"—"a convicted incendiary." "Why is it that this convicted incendiary, and others of the same stamp, are permitted, week after week, to sow the seeds of rebellion, insulting the government, and defying the laws of the country? We have laws to prevent the exposure of unwholesome meat in our markets, and the mixture of deleterious drugs in beer. We have laws also against poisoning the minds of the people, by exciting discontent and disaffection; why are not these laws rendered effectual, and enforced as well as the former?" The answer is very obvious. The laws, as they stood at the end of 1816, when this was written, could not touch William Cobbett. He knew well how to manage his strength. He risked no libels. He dealt with general subjects. He called upon the people to assemble and to petition. He exhorted the people against the use of force. He sowed the dragons' teeth, it is true, but they did not rise up as armed men. They rose up in the far more dangerous apparition of the masses, without property, without education, without leaders of any weight or responsibility, demanding the supreme legislative power—the power of universal suffrage. The idea ceased to be a theory—it became a tremendous reality.

HAMPDEN CLUBS; THE SPENCEANS

In a report of a secret committee of the house of commons, presented on the 19th of February, 1817, the Hampden clubs are described as "associated professedly for the purpose of parliamentary reform, upon the most extended principle of universal suffrage and annual parliaments"; but that "in far the greater number of them, and particularly in those which are established in the great manufacturing districts of Lancashire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire, and which are composed of the lower order of artisans, nothing short of a revolution is the object expected and avowed." The testimony of Samuel Bamford shows that, in this early period of their history, the Hampden clubs limited their object to the attainment of parliamentary reform—a sweeping reform, indeed, but not what is understood by the term "revolution." They contended for the right of every male above eighteen years of age, and who paid taxes, to vote for the election of members of parliament; and that parliaments should be elected annually. These demands Bamford describes as "the moderate views and

wishes of the reformers of those days." He adds: "It was not until we became infested by spies, incendiaries, and their dupes—distracting, misleading, and betraying—that physical force was mentioned amongst us. After that our moral power waned; and what we gained by the accession of demagogues, we lost by their criminal violence and the estrangement of real friends." It would appear, however, that in Scotland, at a very early stage of the proceedings of reform clubs, that is in December, 1816, the mode in which large masses of men ordinarily look for the accomplishment of political changes was not so cautiously kept out of view.

Of the Hampden club of London, Sir Francis Burdett was the chairman. Vanity, as well as misery, "makes a man acquainted with strange bed-fellows." Bamford, at the beginning of 1817, came to London as a delegate from the Middleton club, to attend a great meeting of delegates to be assembled in London. The Crown and Anchor tavern was the scene of these deliberations. There was Major Cartwright in the chair—a placid enthusiast, sincere in his belief that unmingled good would be the result of the great experiment which he had so long advocated. The chief supporters were Cobbett, with his shrewd self-possession and "bantering jollity"; and Hunt—"orator Hunt," as he was called—the incarnation of an empty, blustering, restless, ignorant, and selfish demagogue. The great baronet was absent, and his absence provoked no little comment. But he was accessible in his own mansion. Samuel Bamford was awe-struck by the passionate bellowing of Hunt, frozen by the proud condescension of Sir Francis Burdett, but charmed by the unaffected cordiality of Lord Cochrane. These were the chief actors in the procession scenes of the popular drama that was then under rehearsal. Other and more important parts were filled quite as appropriately.

The Middleton delegate was introduced, amidst the reeking tobacco-fog of a low tavern, to the leading members of a society called the "Spencean Philanthropists." They derived their name from that of a Mr. Spence, a schoolmaster in Yorkshire, who had conceived a plan for making the nation happy, by causing all the lands of the country to become the property of the state, which state should divide all the produce for the support of the people. Socialism, in its extremist principles, is not a new doctrine. The schoolmaster was an honest enthusiast, who fearlessly submitted his plan to the consideration of all lovers of their species, and had the misfortune to be prosecuted for its promulgation in 1800. In 1816 "Spence's plan" was revived, and the Society of Spencean Philanthropists was instituted, who held "sectional meetings," and discussed "subjects calculated to enlighten the human understanding." This great school of philosophy had its separate academies, as London was duly informed by various announcements, at "the Cock, in Grafton Street, Soho," and "the Mulberry Tree, Moorfields," and "the Nag's Head, Carnaby Market," and "No. 8, Lumber street, Borough." At these temples of benevolence, where "every individual is admitted, free of expense, who will conduct himself with decorum," it is not unlikely that some esoteric doctrines were canvassed, such as that "it was an easy matter to upset government, if handled in a proper manner." The committee of the Spenceans openly meddled with sundry grave questions besides that of a community in land; and, amongst other notable projects, petitioned parliament to do away with machinery. Amongst these fanatics some dangerous men had established themselves, such as Thistlewood, who subsequently paid the penalty of five years of maniacal plotting; and some, also, who were clearly in communication with the police, and hounded on the weak disciples of the Cock in Grafton street and the Mulberry Tree in Moorfields, to acts

[1816 A.D.]

of more real danger to themselves than to the public safety. If we are to believe the chief evidence in these transactions, John Castle, a man of the most disreputable character, who became a witness against the leading Spencean philanthropists, they had murderous designs of sharp machines for destroying cavalry, and plans for suffocating quiet soldiers in their barracks, destroying them as boys burn wasps' nests; and schemes for taking the Tower, and barricading London bridge, to prevent the artillery coming from Woolwich. And there were to be five commanders to effect all these great movements of strategy—Mr. Thistlewood, Mr. Watson the elder, and Mr. Watson the younger, Mr. Castle, and Mr. Preston, who came the last in dignity "because he was lame." And then there was to be a committee of public safety, who were to be called together after the soldiers were subdued—twenty-four good and true men. And then they calculated at what amount of public expense they could buy the soldiers, by giving them each a hundred guineas; and, upon an accurate computation, it was found that the purchase money would be somewhere about two millions, which would be nothing in comparison with the national debt, which would be wiped off. With this preparation, if we may believe the very questionable evidence of Mr. Castle, a meeting was held in Spa fields on the 15th of November.

THE SPA-FIELDS RIOT (1816 A.D.)

The district known as Spa fields, now covered with dwellings of industry and comfortable residences of the middle class, was, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and for some years afterwards, a large unenclosed space, utterly neglected and useless. A public house was there, called by the mysterious name of Merlin's Cave; and thither Mr. Hunt came in a chariot with the Watsons and harangued a mob from the chariot roof, attended with a flag and cockades, and "everything handsome." After adjourning the meeting for a fortnight, Mr. Hunt and the chariot went away, drawn by the mob; and the mob running the chariot against a wall, they all got out and walked. So innocently passed the first Spa-fields meeting—innocently, save that at a dinner at Mr. Hunt's hotel in Bouverie street, where, as he represented the matter, the philanthropists having thrust themselves upon him very much against his will, the betrayer, Castle, gave a toast, which is too infamous to be repeated here, and was threatened to be turned out of the room, but quietly remained, and went into what was described as "a fox-sleep." But the 2nd of December, the day to which the first meeting was adjourned, closed not so peaceably. Mr. Hunt came to town from Essex in his tandem, and, as he passed along Cheapside, at "twenty minutes to one o'clock," he was stopped by Mr. Castle, who was moving along with a considerable crowd; and the worthy man told him that the meeting had been broken up two hours, and that they were going to the Tower, which had been in their possession for an hour. The country squire, to whom "the boisterous hallooing of multitudes was more pleasing than the chinkling of the plough-traces, the bleating of lambs, or the song of the nightingale" (in these terms Cobbett defended his friend for his aspirations after mob popularity), was not weak enough to believe the tempter; and his tandem went on to Spa fields, where the greatest number of people were collected together that he had ever beheld. But more active reformers were in Spa fields before Mr. Hunt. The Spencean philanthropists had provided a wagon for their own operations, and arrived on the ground considerably before the appointed hour of meeting, with banners and inscriptions, one of which was, "The brave soldiers are our

[1816 A.D.]

friends!" These men also brought arms and ammunition, which they deposited in their wagon. Mr. Watson the elder commenced a sufficiently violent address, and then his son followed him. The young madman, after declaiming against the uselessness of petition, cried out, "If they will not give us what we want, shall we not take it? Are you willing to take it? Will you go and take it? If I jump down amongst you, will you come and take it? Will you follow me?" And as at every question the encouraging "Yes" became louder and louder, and put down the dissentient "No," he jumped from the wagon, seized a tri-coloured flag, and away rushed the mob to take the Tower. Two resolute men, the chief clerk of Bow street and a Bowstreet officer, had the boldness to attack this mob, and destroyed one of their banners, without any injury to themselves. The work of mischief necessarily went on. The young fanatic led his followers to the shop of a Mr. Beckwith, a gunsmith on Snow hill; and, rushing in, demanded arms. A gentleman in the shop remonstrated with him, and, without any pause, was immediately shot by him. Instantly some compunction seems to have come over this furious leader, and he offered to examine the wounded man, saying he was himself a surgeon. The assassin was secured, but the mob, who destroyed and plundered the shop, soon released him, and proceeded along Cheapside, where they fired their recently acquired arms, like children with a new plaything. They marched through the Royal Exchange, where they were met by the lord mayor, and several were secured. The city magistrates on this occasion behaved with a firmness which admirably contrasted with the pusillanimity of their predecessors in the riots of 1780. The courage of the lord mayor, Alderman Wood, and of Sir James Shaw, is worthy of honourable record; and it shows, not only the insignificance of the so-called conspiracy, its want of coherence and of plan, but the real power of virtue in action to put down ordinary tumult. Sir James Shaw says: "On the 2nd of December last I was at the Royal Exchange at half-past twelve; I saw the mob first in Cornhill; the lord mayor and I went in pursuit of them; they crossed the front of the Royal Exchange; we rushed through the Royal Exchange to take them in front on the other side; the lord mayor and I having received information of prior occurrences, determined on putting them down. I seized several of them, and one flag of three colours, extended on a very long pole. I did not then perceive any arms. . . . The lord mayor and I went to meet the mob with Mr. White and two constables; we got five constables in all; the whole party consisted of eight."

Such is the way in which the beginnings of seditions ought to be met. Firmness such as this would have saved Bristol in 1832. After a further plunder of gunsmiths' shops in the Minories, and the summoning of the Tower by some redoubted and unknown champion, who Bamford tells us was Preston, the insurrection fell to pieces, altogether from the want of cohesion in the materials of which it was composed. The only blood shed was that of the gentleman in Mr. Beckwith's shop, who eventually recovered. A wretched sailor was convicted of the offence of plunder at the shop on Snow hill, and was hanged. The younger Watson escaped from his pursuers. The elder Watson was tried for high treason on the 9th of June. The trial lasted seven days. It was memorable from what Lord Campbell^{bb} calls "the eccentric exuberance of Sir Charles Wetherell, and the luminous energy of Sergeant Copley," who were assigned as counsel for the prisoner. The exposure of Castle, the spy, was so complete that the jury, without hesitation, returned a verdict of not guilty. Four other prisoners, who were to have been tried upon the same evidence, were at once acquitted.^b

[1816 A.D.]

WAR WITH THE BARBARY STATES (1816 A.D.)

A great national victory of this year, achieved as it also was on England's favourite element and by the right arm of English conquests and triumphs, was better calculated than most events to cheer the public despondency. The piracies, man-stealing, butchery, and plunder which the Barbary states on the Mediterranean had been allowed to practise, had been for ages a standing reproach to Christendom. The dread of the naval power of England had for a long time secured British ships and subjects from the attacks of these barbarians; and if now and then a British sailor was captured and sold into slavery, it was while serving under some foreign flag. There were not wanting among us men of narrow hearts and narrower heads, who would fain have left these Barbary corsairs undisturbed, considering the immunity of the British flag as a great commercial advantage over the other European nations; but such thoughts found no place in the liberal mind of the nation; and Britain was the first to make a costly exertion for the abatement of a monstrous nuisance from which she herself was suffering nothing, and had nothing to fear. It has been well said (by Wallace') that "the enterprise was still more distinguished for the generosity of its motives, than even for its brilliant success." Early in the spring of this year Admiral Lord Exmouth, commanding in the Mediterranean, received orders to demand from the beys of Tripoli and Tunis, and the dey of Algiers, satisfaction and protection for the flags of the Ionian Isles, "which the congress of Vienna had left under our protection," and the flags of Naples and Sardinia, together with the total abandonment of Christian slavery. Tripoli and Tunis, taking counsel of their weakness, implicitly complied; but Algiers, relying on her great strength, offered only a partial satisfaction for the past, and refused or temporised for the rest.

Before taking any steps in fulfilment of his instructions, Lord Exmouth made all the arrangements necessary for an attack, which was to be the alternative if negotiations failed—a result much to be expected at Algiers, which had hitherto withstood so many formidable armaments. His lordship ordered Captain Warde of the *Banterer* to proceed to Algiers, and then carefully to observe the town and the nature of its defences, to draw a plan of the works on the seaward side, to take soundings, to make his observations on the anchorage, etc. "Lord Exmouth's instructions on this occasion," says Osler,⁴ "which were written with his own hand, afforded an admirable illustration of the forethought with which he provided for every contingency, and which was the chief secret of his constant success." Captain Warde performed his difficult and important service with wonderful skill and secrecy.

The admiralty were greatly surprised when Lord Exmouth proposed to attack Algiers with only five sail of the line. Many naval officers, upon being consulted by the board, considered those works as altogether unassailable by ships. His lordship was offered any force he required, but he firmly adhered to his first demand; for he had satisfied himself that five ships could destroy the great fortifications on the mole as effectually as a greater number, and with far more safety to themselves. After he had explained his plans, and marked the position which every ship was to occupy, the admiralty allowed him to act upon his own judgment. "All will go well," said this brave sailor and most excellent man; "all will go well, as far at least as it depends on me. I know that nothing can resist a line-of-battle ships' fire." On the 9th of August the veteran was at Gibraltar. Here he found a Dutch squadron of five frigates and a corvette, commanded by Vice-Admiral the baron de Capellan,

who, on learning the object of the expedition, solicited and obtained leave to co-operate. On Tuesday, the 27th of August, they came in sight of Algiers.

As the ships lay nearly becalmed, Lord Exmouth sent Lieutenant Burgess in a boat under a flag of truce with the terms dictated by the prince regent, and a demand for the immediate liberation of the British consul and some other persons whom the dey had cast into prison. At eleven o'clock A.M. Lieutenant Burgess was met outside the mole by the captain of the port, who received the communication and promised an answer in two hours. In the mean time a breeze springing up, the fleet stood into the bay and lay to, about a mile from the town. At two o'clock Lieutenant Burgess and the boat were seen returning with the signal that no answer had been given. The admiral's ship, the *Queen Charlotte*, instantly telegraphed to the fleet, "Are you ready?" And instantly the affirmative signal was displayed from every ship, and they all, English and Dutch, frigates and ships of the line, bore up to their appointed stations. The *Queen Charlotte* led to the attack. There was to be no firing from her until she came to anchor. The Algerines, confident in the strength of their works, also reserved their fire; indeed, they expected to carry the flagship by boarding her from their numerous gunboats. The *Queen Charlotte* proceeded silently to her position; and at half-past two she anchored, by the stern, just half a cable's length from the terrible mole-head. "The mole was crowded with troops, many of whom got upon the parapet to look at the ship; and Lord Exmouth, observing them as he stood upon the poop, waved to them to move away. As soon as the ship was fairly placed and her cables stoppered the crew gave three hearty cheers, such as Englishmen only can give. Scarcely had the sound of the last died away, when a gun was fired from the upper tier of the eastern battery, and a second and a third followed in quick succession. One of the shots struck the *Superb*. At the first flash Lord Exmouth gave the order, "Stand by!" at the second, "Fire!" The report of the third gun was drowned in the thunder of the *Queen Charlotte's* broadside.

The Algerines replied with the fire of nearly five hundred guns. The mole was filled with cannon, like the side of a line-of-battle ship, mostly disposed in a double tier, with ports below and embrasures above; but the eastern batteries, next the lighthouse, had an inner fortification, with a third tier of guns, making sixty-six in these eastern batteries alone. These different batteries on the mole mounted altogether about two hundred and twenty guns, eighteen being twenty-four or thirty-two pounders, and two of them being sixty-eight pounders, upwards of twenty feet long. All these guns were brought to bear point-blank upon Lord Exmouth's ships of the line. Some of his lordship's frigates and some of the Dutch frigates took up positions which three-deckers might have been justly proud of. There were a few bomb-vessels, whose shells were thrown with admirable precision by the marine artillery. There was no lack of courage and resolution on the part of the corsairs. Shortly after the commencement of the battle their flotilla of gunboats most daringly advanced to board the *Queen Charlotte* and the *Leander*. At first the smoke covered and concealed them, but so soon as they were seen a few well-directed shot sent thirty-three out of thirty-seven of these Algerine gunboats to the bottom. At four o'clock a large Algerine frigate was boarded and set on fire. As she burst into a flame Lord Exmouth telegraphed to the fleet the animating signal, "Infallible!" Before seven o'clock all the vessels in port, except a brig and a schooner, were burning fast to the water's edge. As for the tremendous works on the mole-head, they had been ruined by the single fire of the *Queen Charlotte* a very few minutes after the combat had

[1816-1817 A.D.]

commenced. The fleet slackened their fire towards night, while the guns of the enemy became silent, and when the necessity was felt of husbanding their ammunition. The expenditure had been beyond all precedent. Our ships had fired nearly 118 tons of powder and 50,000 shot, weighing more than 500 tons of iron, besides 960 thirteen- and ten-inch shells. Such a fire, close, concentrated, and well directed as it was, nothing could resist. The mighty sea defences of Algiers, with great part of the town itself, were shattered and crumbled to ruins.

As the night darkened the breeze freshened, and a tremendous storm of thunder and lightning came on, with torrents of rain; while the flaming ships and storehouses illuminated all the ruins on shore, which increased the awfulness of the scene. In scarcely any former general action had the casualties been so great in proportion to the force employed. In the British ships 128 were killed and 690 wounded; and the Dutch, who had behaved most gallantly, had 13 killed and 52 wounded. The veteran commander-in-chief escaped most narrowly; he was struck in three places, and a cannon-shot tore away the skirts of his coat, breaking one of the glasses and bulging the rim of the spectacles in his pocket.

On the 28th, at daylight, Lieutenant Burgess was sent on shore with a flag of truce, and with the same demands he had carried the preceding morning; our bomb-vessels at the same time resuming their positions. Lord Exmouth was immediately given to understand that all his demands would be submitted to. On the morning of the 29th Captain Brisbane, of the flagship, went on shore, and had a conference with the humbled and astounded dey. The negotiations were intrusted to Sir Charles Penrose. They were very short, for the Algerines could do nothing but submit and agree. The chief conditions were: the abolition of Christian slavery forever, the surrender of all their slaves of whatever nation, and the dey's humble and public apology in person for the insult he had given to the British flag.

Three thousand Christians were delivered from slavery and sent to their own countries and homes. Leaving a ship to receive a few more, Lord Exmouth sailed for England on the 3rd of September. Scarcely Nelson himself had been in hotter fires than Exmouth, yet his lordship declared that he had never been under a fire so hot and terrible as this at Algiers. "The fire all round the mole," said he,* "looked like pandemonium. I never saw anything so grand and so terrific; for I was not on velvet, for fear they would drive on board us. Their copper-bottoms floated full of fiery hot charcoal and were red-hot above the surface, so that we could not hook on our fire-grapnels to put the boats to, and could do nothing but push out fire-booms and spring the ship off by our warps, as occasion required. I never saw any set of men more obstinate at their guns, and it was superior fire only that could keep them back. To be sure, nothing could stand before the *Queen Charlotte's* broadside. Everything fell before it; and the Swedish consul assures me we killed above five hundred at the very first fire, from the crowded way in which their troops were drawn up, four deep, above the gunboats, which were also full of men. I believe they are within bounds when they state their loss at seven thousand men."

THE FIVE ACTS (1817 A.D.)

With the commencement of 1817 the public depression occasioned by the reverses which peace had so unexpectedly introduced was not alleviated. Industry in all its commercial and agricultural departments was still under

arrest, and bankruptcies continued to multiply: the rich were suffering under the high price of the common necessities of life and an income-tax of 10 per cent.; while the working classes, whose wages had fallen from fifteen to five shillings a week, could scarcely procure the scantiest means of living. The prevalent poverty and distress was laid hold of as an opportunity to propagate a spirit of discontent and disloyalty; and both from the press and the platform, remedies of the most anarchical and destructive kind continued to be recommended by mischievous demagogues, who attempted to demonstrate that no relief could be obtained unless the present order of things was swept away and a new government established. These evils were sadly acknowledged in the speech from the throne at the opening of parliament, on the 28th of January; and in reference to those attempts which were making to take advantage of such a state of things, for the purposes of rebellion and change, it was announced that no precautions would be omitted for preserving the public peace and counteracting the designs of the disaffected. A melancholy comment upon this speech followed on the regent's return; for as he passed through the park he was assailed by the mob with loud clamours and revilings; stones and other missiles were thrown at his carriage, and from the manner in which the windows were broken, it was alleged that this effect must have been produced by bullets discharged from an air-gun. This alarming fact was announced in the afternoon in the house of lords by Lord Sidmouth, secretary for the home department, and the two houses by proclamation offered a reward of £1,000 for the apprehension of the daring perpetrators. But they could never be found; the air-gun was supposed to exist only in apprehension, and it was declared that insult rather than assassination had been the purpose of the mob, who had used no worse weapons than stones or gravel.

On the following day there was fierce altercation in both houses on this subject of alarm; and while it was ridiculed by Lord Dudley under the title of the "pop-gun plot," the opposition both in the lords and the commons saw in it nothing more than an argument for retrenchment in every department of government. Further discussion was suspended by the intimation of Lord Sidmouth, that in three days he should present a message from the prince regent on the subject of the alleged defection of large bodies of the people. The message was delivered on the 3rd of February, and on its being referred to a secret committee of both houses, they made their reports on the 18th and 19th. In these a declaration was given of the general state of the country, and of the societies or clubs either existing or to be established throughout the whole of Great Britain, which, under the pretext of parliamentary reform, had for their main object the eversion of all law, religion, and morality, and the plunder of all property. After detailing at length the several districts in which these associations existed, and the variety of their aims and principles, but all sufficiently revolutionary and dangerous, the panic became so great that no measures were thought too stringent for the prevention of the evil. Accordingly, five bills, called the "Five Acts," were introduced and passed by large majorities, who seem at the moment to have thought that no sacrifice could be too great when the state itself was on the point of perishing. They were as follows: 1. A bill to extend to the person of the prince regent the act for the better protection of his majesty's person. 2. A bill to revive the act of 1795 against seditious meetings. 3. A bill to revive the act of 39 George III against corresponding societies. 4. A bill to revive the act against such as seduce soldiers and sailors. 5. A bill to suspend the habeas corpus act. All these were successively carried before the end of March. The last and most dangerous of them all, which gave to the execu-

[1817-1819 A.D.]

tive power the despotic privilege of imprisoning without trial, was not carried without a struggle, in which Earl Grey, Lord Wellesley, Lord Darnley, Sir Arthur Pigott, and other members of both houses, distinguished themselves by their opposition to the measure. Although the suspension of the habeas corpus act was decreed, it was to continue in force only till the 1st of July; and it only passed in consequence of the fresh alarms of meetings and conspiracies with which the ears of parliament had been assailed. The event dismayed the leaders and orators of reform who had been so active and so loud in the propagation of their doctrines; and they either retired into obscurity or maintained a cautious silence. Even Cobbett, the boldest as well as ablest of them all, was fain to withdraw to America until the season of danger had expired.

TROOPS WITHDRAWN FROM FRANCE (1818 A.D.)

The chief political event by which the year 1818 was signalised was the full and complete reconciliation of the allied powers with France by withdrawing their army of occupation. This occupation was a painful reminiscence of past wars and mutual injuries; it was galling to a high-spirited people like the French; and as long as it was continued there was no assurance to Europe of international amity or a lasting peace. According to the terms of the original treaty, this military hold upon France would have continued two years longer, had not the present stability of the Bourbon throne and the general tranquillity given assurance that such a precaution was no longer required. A congress was therefore assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle during the autumn of the current year, where the emperor of Russia, the king of Prussia, and the emperor of Austria, with their principal ministers, the duke of Wellington and the representatives of some other powers, agreed that the army of occupation might be safely withdrawn, and the nation left to its own control. A negotiation to this effect was accordingly opened by the allied sovereigns with Louis XVIII; the pecuniary obligations of France were discharged, and the army, with its commander, the duke of Wellington, was recalled in October, after having been in France three years.

REFORMS OF 1819

The beginning of the year 1819 was signalised by the opening of the new parliament, which assembled on the 14th of January, and Mr. Manners Sutton was re-elected speaker without competition. A very important subject of this session was the revision of the criminal code. The sanguinary character of English law had long been a wonder and reproach among foreigners, as well as a matter of regret among the reflective people of England; and it was felt that the time had come when the frequency of capital punishments might very safely be diminished. Repeatedly the subject had been brought before parliament by that upright and talented lawyer, Sir Samuel Romilly; but in consequence of his death in the preceding year, it was now adopted and advocated with equal ability by Sir James Mackintosh. The time also was favourable, on account of a petition from the corporation of London complaining of the increase of crime, and pointing out the advantage that might accrue from the commutation of capital punishments for others of less severity. This momentous inquiry it was resolved to consign to a committee employed upon the examination of prison discipline, when, on the following day, Sir James Mackintosh proposed that the examination of the penal code

[1819 A.D.]

should have a distinct committee of its own. After showing the subterfuges which the severity of the laws occasioned, and the difficulty of obtaining a conviction, in consequence of which the worst culprits escaped and the statutes became a dead letter, he explained his views of those circumstances under which alone capital punishment should be administered, whereby not less than one hundred and fifty offences needed to be expunged from the catalogue. His motion was carried, and before the end of the session a committee of inquiry was formed, of which he was appointed chairman.

Another very momentous affair of this session was the consideration of the national currency. The commencement of the war in 1793, and the return of peace in 1815, had equally produced an abrupt diversion of capital, which was keenly felt by the productive classes, and finally by the whole community. To this was added the want of money accommodations during the period of agricultural distress, in consequence of the Bank of England, at the return of peace, having been obliged to reduce its paper circulation, from the apprehension of soon being called upon to pay in gold. Country bankers were in like manner compelled to limit their issues, until the question of the resumption of cash payments by the Bank of England should be settled. It was no wonder that a subject of such vital importance to every individual should have given rise to about fifty debates and conversations in both houses of parliament. The principal parts of the government plan, which was finally adopted, were the following: That it was expedient that the restrictions on payments in cash by the bank should be continued beyond the 5th of July, 1819, the term fixed by law; that a definite period should be fixed for the termination of the restriction, and that in the mean time certain preparatory measures should be taken; that provision should be made for the gradual repayment to the bank of £10,000,000 of its advances for the public service; that from the 1st of February, 1820, the bank should be obliged to give in exchange for its notes gold, assayed and stamped, in quantities of not less than sixty ounces, at the rate of 81s. per ounce; that from the 1st of October, 1820, it should be obliged to pay gold for its notes in the same manner, at the rate of 79s. 6d. per ounce; that after the 1st of May, 1821, the rate should be 77s. 10½d. per ounce; that from the 1st of May, 1823, the bank should pay its notes on demand, in the legal coin of the realm; and that the laws prohibiting the melting and exportation of the coin should be repealed.

THE MANCHESTER RIOTS (1819 A.D.)

The session was closed by the regent in person, on the 13th of July. In the close of his speech he adverted to the seditious spirit still at work in the manufacturing districts; and notwithstanding the self-gratulations of ministers at the opening of parliament, the existence of such a spirit was too notorious to be denied. The extravagant hopes which the many had founded upon the return of peace had been disappointed; for its benefits, instead of being instant and immediate, were of slow growth, while low wages and high-priced provisions were still the order of the day. Under such circumstances it was easy for restless demagogues to persuade the ignorant multitudes that their continued depression arose from a corrupt court, a venal ministry, and unjust taxes; and that the blessing of peace and the fruits of their own industry could not be realised until these obstacles were removed. It was even queried in their more private meetings, whether the people had not a right to destroy the Bank of England, and to equalise all classes by an agrarian

[1819 A.D.]

division of the landed property of the country. In such a state of things the government could not look tranquilly on, or its adherents be without alarm; and the commencement of open strife and bloodshed was nothing more than a question of time and place, which circumstances were sure to settle. This was done at Manchester on the 16th of August, 1819. The reformers of that city having convened a great public meeting on the 9th, with the object of proceeding, in their own way, to the choice and election of a parliamentary representative, were apprised by the magistrates that the object was illegal, and that such meeting was illegal; upon which the design was modified, and a meeting convened for the 16th to petition for a sweeping reform in parliament.

A little before noon on the 16th the first body of reformers began to arrive on the scene of action, which was a piece of ground called St. Peter's Field. These persons bore two banners surmounted with caps of liberty, and bearing the inscriptions—"No Corn Laws," "Annual Parliaments," "Universal Suffrage," "Vote by Ballot." The flags, after being paraded round the field, were planted on a wagon, on which the orators of the day had taken their stand; but other flags appeared and remained stationary in different parts of the crowd. Numerous large bodies of radicals continued to arrive from the towns in the neighbourhood of Manchester till about one o'clock, all preceded by flags, and many of them came up in regular marching order, five deep, as if they had been well drilled and trained. Two clubs of female reformers advanced, one of them numbering more than 150 members, and bearing a white silk banner. There was a body of reformers who timed their steps to the sound of a bugle, with much of a disciplined air; there was another that had assumed the motto of the illustrious Wallace, "God armeth the patriot." The multitude now amounted to a number roundly computed at eighty thousand, and the arrival of the hero of the day was impatiently looked for by the radicals. Nothing less than a fearful riot, with murder and plunder, was expected by the merchants, mill-owners, and the prosperous classes generally. At last orator Hunt made his appearance, and, after a rapturous greeting, was invited to preside. Mounting a scaffolding, he began to harangue his admirers. A band of special constables who had taken up a position on the field without resistance now disposed themselves so as to form a line of communication from a house where the magistrates were sitting to the stage or platform erected for Mr. Hunt.

The orator had not proceeded far when the appearance of the yeomanry cavalry advancing at a brisk trot excited a panic in the outskirts of the meeting. The civic force entered the inclosure, and after pausing for a minute to recover their disordered ranks, they drew their swords and brandished them in the air. The multitude, by the direction of their leaders, gave three cheers, to show that they were undaunted by this intrusion, and the orator had just resumed his speech to assure the people that this was only a trick to disturb the meeting, and exhorted them to stand firm, when the yeomanry dashed into the crowd, making for the platform. That immense mob offered no resistance; they fell back on all sides, overturning one another. The commanding officer approached orator Hunt, and brandishing his sword, told him that he was his prisoner. Some of the yeomanry then cried out, "Have at their flags!" and upon this the troop began to strike down the banners raised in various parts of the fields, cutting to right and left to get at them. The people scampered off in all directions, and the yeomanry spurred after them, losing all command of temper. There was then a dreadful scene of confusion; numbers were trampled under the feet of men and horses; many

[1819-1820 A.D.]

women as well as men were cut down by sabres; several were slain on the spot, and among these were a peace officer and a female—for the undisciplined heroes scarcely knew what they were doing, and slew where they wished to save. The whole number of persons more or less injured was set down at between three hundred and four hundred; but it should appear that this number was exaggerated by the suffering party, and that nine-tenths of the injuries received were of a very trifling nature. In their retreat the reformers threw stones and brickbats at the yeomanry. It is said that some stones were thrown in the same direction before the yeomen charged the people, and that the riot act was read by the magistrates before a sword was used; but some doubt rests upon one, if not upon both, of these assertions. The yeomanry was chiefly composed of a set of hot-headed young men belonging to rich families, who entertained a too great contempt and dislike of spinners, and weavers, and dyers, machine makers, and other artisans, who made up the reform assemblage. The riot act was read, but it seems to have been read when nobody could hear it. In less than ten minutes from the first charge of the yeomanry the ground was entirely cleared of its former occupants, and was filled by various bodies of military, both horse and foot. Mr. orator Hunt, with the broken staves of two of his banners carried in mock procession before him, was hurried before the magistrates, who sent him to prison on a charge of high treason.

THE SIX ACTS (1820 A.D.)

As soon as the news of this riot and its suppression reached London a cabinet council was held; and acting on the partial statements of the despatch, the thanks of government were returned to the magistrates, and to all the military engaged, for their prompt and efficient conduct in the affair. This was a signal for the opponents of government and friends of reform in London; and at a numerous meeting held in the palace yard, Westminster, on the 2nd of September, at which Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. John Cam Hobhouse, his colleague in the representation of Westminster, were the principal speakers, the affair of Peter's Field was denounced as a massacre, and a foul attempt to destroy the liberties of Englishmen; and an address founded on these resolutions was sent to the prince regent. The opposite party were provoked by the occasion to call meetings of their own, in which counter addresses were drawn up, justifying the suppression of the Manchester meeting, and offering to raise yeomanry corps for the support of government and the maintenance of public order. Under such auspices the prisoners were brought to trial; but the capital charge of treason against them was abandoned, and imprisonment, from one to two years and a half, was the utmost punishment inflicted upon five of the chief leaders of the meeting. Still the alarm had been too great and the supporters of government were too numerous to allow the present state of affairs to go on unchecked; and to obtain the restoration of order and secure the inviolability of their own property they were but too ready to place an undue power in the hands of the ministry. The well-known "Six Acts" were introduced, and were carried by large majorities through both houses. In the lords they were proposed by Viscount Sidmouth; in the commons by Lord Castlereagh. They consisted of the following bills: 1. To take away the right of traversing in cases of misdemeanor. 2. To punish any person found guilty on a second conviction of libel, by fine, imprisonment, and banishment for life. 3. For preventing seditious meetings, requiring the names of seven householders to the requisition which, in future,

[1819-1820 A.D.]

convened any meeting for the discussion of subjects connected with church or state. 4. To prohibit military training, except under the authority of a magistrate or lord lieutenant. 5. To subject cheap periodical pamphlets on political subjects to a duty similar to that on newspapers. 6. To give magistrates the power of entering houses by night or by day, for the purpose of seizing arms believed to be collected for unlawful purposes. The only one of these bills which passed without opposition was that for the prevention of secret military training. The entering of houses by night, and the restrictions on the press, were strongly objected to. These acts were to continue in force for the term of five years.

The year 1820 commenced with gloomy auspices in the political horizon. On the 21st of January the humane, benevolent, and popular duke of Kent died, leaving behind him an infant daughter, Alexandrina Victoria. Only eight days after the duke's death the great bell of St. Paul's again sent forth its deep knell, to announce a demise of still higher importance, for his father, the king of the realm, had departed.

DEATH OF GEORGE III (1820 A.D.)

George III died in Windsor Castle on the night of Saturday, the 29th of January, 1820, in the eighty-second year of his age, and (counting the ten years of the regency) in the sixtieth year of his reign. For some years before his death he had been totally blind; and it does not appear that any temporary return of reason allowed him to comprehend and rejoice at the issue of the momentous struggle in which he left his country engaged in 1810, when his malady drove him into retirement. We only know that when others desponded his hopes were high, and that, so long as he had reason, he never despaired of the final triumph of England. No man within his realms had a more thoroughly English heart, or a more ardent desire to promote the welfare of the people and the interests and honour of the country. Unpopular in his youth and earliest government, he became endeared to the people in the midst of the misfortunes of the first American war; and perhaps no sovereign had ever been more popular than he was during the last twenty-five years of his reign. Nearly every circumstance concerning him which has been brought to light of late years, and nearly every conversation which has been reported, or letter written by him which has been published, have tended to clear away the prejudices of former times, and to raise our estimate, not merely of the goodness of his heart and intentions, but also of the powers of his intellect, and of his capacity for public business.¹

THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE IV (1820 A.D.)

The accession of George IV to the throne was merely nominal, for virtually he had been king for the last ten years; but the glories of his regency, through the success of our arms, had eclipsed whatever could be expected from his sovereignty, surrounded as he was by political and domestic troubles, which his new position could only tend to aggravate. He had also passed the bright meridian of life, and at the period of his accession was laid upon a bed of sickness, from which it was at one time feared he would never rise. Even his assumption of the royal title was accompanied with a great embarrassment. George IV was king, but who was queen of Great Britain? In the alter-

[¹ "Expressed in concise terms," says Aubray, "the long reign of George III comprises sixty years of blundering, injustice, and repression."

[1819-1830 A.D.]

ation of the form of prayer in the church service the name of her who was legally queen consort had been omitted; and as princess of Wales her allowance from the civil list had ceased with the death of George III. It was now asked in parliament whether she, their queen, was to be supported according to her high station, or left to wander in beggary through foreign lands. It was a perplexing question both for her friends and enemies, as the former saw no need for the claim of a title which they considered as hers by law already, while the latter were unwilling to concede it. A vote, therefore, of a royal yearly allowance was passed in her favour without a division, but also without specifying her royal right and title to such allowance. On the close of parliament, by commission, on the 28th of February, the lord chancellor, in his speech on the occasion, turned the public attention into a new channel by announcing that a fearful conspiracy had just been detected, sufficient to open the eyes of the most sceptical to the dangers in which the country was involved. The danger alluded to was the Cato-street conspiracy.¹

THE CATO-STREET CONSPIRACY (1820 A.D.)

For some time before the Manchester massacre of August, 1819, there had been a subsidence of the sedition and rebellious intentions of the sufferers and demagogues who had caused a panic to the government and a portion of the country magistracy of England and Scotland. The extensive conspiracy supposed by the ruling powers had never existed, and the separate parties of malcontents who had employed the leisure and relieved the painful thoughts of poverty in seditious movements had become tired of fruitless efforts, of disappointment in their leaders, and of that failure in combination which is the invariable lot of the ill-informed and inexperienced when they aim at objects too large for their powers. Their funds fell off; their drillings ceased from non-attendance; and they dropped back into their sad homes, to mutter there their discontents or wait for better days. But the Manchester affair and the subsequent proceedings roused them again as by an express summons, and during the months of September, October, and November there was a busy reorganisation of the associations of the discontented, who put aside their mutual quarrels to carry on the grand one with the government. It was in November that Sir Herbert Taylor, who held a high office in the establishment of the king, was accosted at Windsor by a man named Edwards, who kept a small shop at Eton for the sale of plaster casts, and who gave information of a desperate plot against the ministers. This information was, of course, immediately communicated to Lord Sidmouth. Edwards was taken into the pay of the home office; and the police were employed to verify his statements during the months when he stimulated the purposes of the conspirators, and received their confidence, in order to betray them, day by day, to his paymasters. It was after the affair became known to the government, that an emissary of Oliver the spy appeared at Middleton and elsewhere, and told of other agents who were going about the country with the same commission—to engage the discontented to join in the plot of Thistlewood and his comrades to assassinate the ministers, seize the Bank, the Mansion House, and the Tower, and establish a provisional government. The discontented refused to join. The scheme was too horrible and too foolish. In the end it appeared that the number involved was very small; so small, that the affair would scarcely deserve a place in history, but for the atrocity of the plan, and the illustration the event affords of the working of the spy system adopted by the government of the day.

[1820 A.D.]

The leader, Thistlewood, was a desperate man; too vindictive about his private wrongs to make much pretence of patriotism. He had been engaged with the Watsons, and acquitted on his trial for that matter. After his acquittal, he had sent a challenge to Lord Sidmouth; and this piece of audacity had procured him a year's imprisonment. He came out of jail thirsty for the blood of the minister. He drew about him a few ignorant and desperate men; and they would have attempted the deed at once—in the autumn of 1819—but for a series of accidents which delayed the enterprise, and gave time for an aggravation of their wickedness by the arts of Edwards the informer. When the affair had been delayed till Christmas, there came the dispersion of the intended victims for the holidays; and then the death of the king and the duke of Kent, and the royal funerals; and perhaps Edwards, who furnished the party with so much information about the ministers, might have told the conspirators how uncertain was the tenure of office by their enemies, who were very near going out immediately on the accession of George IV, on account of their refusal to procure him a divorce from his queen. The first record of the existence of the plot is in a note from the duke of Wellington of the 5th of January, wherein he states that he had "just heard that Lord Sidmouth had discovered another conspiracy." On Saturday, February 19th, it was resolved by the gang to murder the ministers, each at his own house; and without further delay, as their poverty would not allow them to wait any longer. On the Tuesday, however, Edwards informed them that there was to be a cabinet dinner at Lord Harrowby's the next day. Thistlewood sent out for a newspaper to see if this was true; and, finding it to be so, remarked, "As there has not been a dinner so long, there will, no doubt, be fourteen or sixteen there; and it will be a rare haul to murder them all together." Thus it was settled. Some of their number were to watch Lord Harrowby's house, to see that no police or soldiers were brought there. One was to call with a note while the ministers were at dinner; and the others were then to rush in, to commit the murders, carrying bags in which to bring away the heads of Lords Sidmouth and Castlereagh. Then they were to fire the cavalry barracks, by throwing fireballs into the straw sheds; and the Bank and Tower were to be taken by the people, who, it was hoped, would rise upon the spread of the news.

Edwards was not the only traitor. A man named Hidon, who afterwards found himself well recompensed by the gift of a hackney coach, went from this final council to warn Lord Harrowby, by putting a letter into his hand during his ride in the park. No notice was apparently taken. The preparations for dinner went on at Lord Harrowby's till eight o'clock in the evening; but the guests did not arrive. The archbishop of York, who lived next door, happened to give a dinner that evening; and the arrival of the carriages deceived those of the conspirators who were on the watch in the street, till it was too late to give warning to their comrades, who had assembled in a stable in Cato street near the Edgeware road.

While the conspirators were arming themselves in a room above this stable, by the light of one or two candles, the ministers, having dined at home, met at Lord Liverpool's, where they awaited, in great anxiety, the tidings of what the police and soldiers had done. When the news arrived it was bad. One of the police had been stabbed through the heart, and Thistlewood had escaped. This was owing to the soldiers not having been ready, as ordered, to turn out at a moment's notice. The police proceeded without them; and Smithers, the man who was killed, mounted the ladder which led from the stable to the upper room. Thistlewood stabbed him, and blew out the light; and after the

[1830 A.D.]

exchange of a few shots in the darkness and confusion several of the conspirators escaped. A reward of £1,000 was immediately offered for the apprehension of Thistlewood; but he was taken before eight o'clock the next morning, in bed at a friend's house in Moorfields. When about fourteen of the conspirators had escaped the soldiers arrived, and captured the remainder of the party—nine prisoners—and their arms and ammunition.

On the publication of the *Gazette* the next morning, with the proclamation of the reward for the apprehension of Thistlewood, London was thrown into consternation, from the natural supposition that this plot was but the first movement of a great insurrection. But there is no evidence that it ever extended beyond the few desperate men who were immediately concerned in it. The vigilance of the government and the magistracy throughout the kingdom detected no more schemes of rebellion, though there were flying rumours from time to time of marches of armies of radicals, who were to burn the towns and overturn the throne. On the 20th of April Thistlewood was condemned to death, after a trial of three days: and on the 1st of May, he and his four principal accomplices were executed [by hanging, the bodies being afterwards decapitated, in accordance with the law]. Five more who pleaded guilty had their punishment commuted to transportation for life; and one, who appears to have been present at Cato street without being aware of the object of the meeting, received a free pardon.^m

SEDITION IN SCOTLAND (1830 A.D.).

Although such a foul, unnational conspiracy stood alone and could find no imitators, the discontent in which it originated was still prevalent in the manufacturing districts, and overt acts of rebellion were not unfrequent. Such was the case in the West Riding of Yorkshire, where there were midnight trainings of the disaffected, with the collecting of firearms and manufacturing of pikes, which had continued during the winter, as a preparation for a general rising; but when the time came, not more than two hundred or three hundred assembled at Huddersfield, and on the advance of a body of cavalry they fled, leaving their pikes and green flag behind them. In Scotland the cause of radicalism was equally rampant; and in Glasgow the walls were placarded with proclamations, supposed to proceed from a committee for the formation of a provisional government, requiring the manufacturers to suspend their employments till further orders from the committee—an imperious command, but readily obeyed by the weavers and colliers of Glasgow and Paisley, so that the streets were filled with thousands of loitering artisans, wondering at the mysterious mandate and talking of a coming revolution. Happily, no worse outbreak resulted from this alarming state of matters in the north than a paltry skirmish at Bonnymuir [the "battle of Bonnymuir"], where a party of armed radicals gave battle to a troop of cavalry and yeomanry, but were dispersed after several of their number had been wounded and nineteen taken prisoners. In all these cases, however, although there was a close imitation of the combinations, purposes, and manifestoes which had characterised the revolutionary proceedings of the French, there was an absence of that violent and sanguinary spirit with which they had been accompanied, and which had formed the source both of their crimes and success. The British reformers were new to revolutions, and were inapt imitators of their more oppressed and less scrupulous and reflective types upon the Continent. In every case, also, government kept a watchful eye upon the disaffected; and both through informers and professional

[1830 A.D.]

spies, whom it appears the ministry did not scruple to employ for the purpose, they were warned of every intended movement and enabled to crush it at the commencement.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORMS (1830 A.D.)

The demise of George III having occasioned a dissolution of parliament, the new elections were marked by few acts of violence, although in many cases party contests were keen; and from the late exposures of unconstitutional proceedings connected with the suppression of political riots, as well as from the increase of numbers added to the opposition, there was little promise that the new house of commons would prove as compliant as the old. Of this an indication was given by a movement in the way of parliamentary reform. This was a bill for the disfranchisement of the corrupt borough of Grampound, which had been moved in the last session by Lord John Russell, and which now passed the second reading. The subject of the amendment of the criminal code was now brought forward by Sir James Mackintosh, in six bills, founded on the suggestions of the committee of inquiry appointed during the last session; and of these bills, after much discussion, three were successfully carried and passed into law. By this change, private stealing in shops to the value of forty shillings, the residence of gipsies for more than one year in the realm, or of notorious thieves taking up their abode in Cumberland or Northumberland, or for any person to be found disguised in the mint, or injuring Westminster bridge, were no longer punishable as capital crimes. Other acts hitherto capital were also modified into simple felonies, such as the receiving of stolen goods, the abduction of any maid, wife, or widow, for the sake of her fortune; the destroying of trees, breaking down the banks of rivers, or wounding cattle; the sending of threatening letters, and all the capital offences that had been connected with the laws of bankruptcy and the Marriage act—the punishment of death in all of these many cases being changed into transportation, imprisonment, hard labour, or fine. It will be seen from the above enumeration that this purifying sweep of the sponge over the defiled pages of the statute book was fully needed, while it will readily be surmised that much more still remained to be accomplished. Mr. Brougham also brought forward his comprehensive and national plan for the education of the poor, but without success; and owing to the jealousy of the dissenters it had finally to be abandoned, but not until it had awoken a spirit of inquiry, by which the good that had been sought was to be effected by other agencies. And not the least important change that had commenced during the session was that which had reference to free trade. During the war, when Britain by her maritime superiority had engrossed the carrying trade and enjoyed a monopoly of commerce, English merchants had rejoiced in this profitable exclusiveness. But now that the war was ended, a period of stagnation had succeeded, and it was felt that a new impulse must be given to commercial industry, even though it should be at the cost of removing these restrictions and admitting every nation into full competition with Britain. The attention of parliament was called to the subject by petitions from the cities of London and Glasgow in favour of free trade, and the propriety of a change in British commercial policy was suggested in the house of lords, on the 26th of May, by Lord Lansdowne, who moved for a committee of inquiry concerning the foreign trade of the empire. He was seconded by the earl of Liverpool, and the motion was unanimously carried.

THE TRIAL OF QUEEN CAROLINE (1830 A.D.)

It was at this stage that every public movement was arrested by the entrance of a new personage on the scene. By the advice of Canning the princess Caroline had retired to Italy in 1814. Of the life she had been leading during her exile there was many an unfavourable and even foul report; and although the "Delicate Investigation" had been extinguished, a new one had followed her in her wanderings, and all the reports that were multiplying against her were collected and sent to London as fresh matters of accusation, should circumstances compel such a step. Our ambassadors, instructed from home, refused to recognise her as princess of Wales, and the courts at which they resided were closed against her entrance. But when her name was struck out of the liturgy, and the recognition of her rank as queen withheld at the accession of her husband, she felt as if her silence would justify her condemnation—that she must come to England to demand an open trial, and vindicate her innocence and her claims. She may have felt, too, that from the irritated state of public feeling and the unpopularity of George IV, the bulk of the nation, right or wrong, would be ready to advocate her cause. Brougham, her principal legal adviser, received her commands to meet her in France. He left London on the 1st of June, bearing the following proposition to the queen, which had been placed in his hands by Lord Liverpool, the premier: "The king is willing to recommend to parliament to enable his majesty to settle an annuity of £50,000 a year upon the queen, to be enjoyed by her during her natural life, and in lieu of any claim in the nature of jointure or otherwise, provided she will engage not to come into any part of the British dominions, and provided she engages to take some other name or title than that of queen, and not to exercise any of the rights or privileges of queen, either with respect to the appointment of law officers, or to any proceedings in courts of justice. The annuity to cease upon the violation of these engagements, *viz.*, upon her coming into any part of the British dominions, or her assuming the title of queen, or her exercising any of the rights or privileges of queen, other than above excepted, after the annuity shall have been settled upon her."

The princess, who ever proclaimed that she was supported by the consciousness of her own innocence, rejected these propositions with disdain, and declared that she would presently be in England to confront her enemies and to appeal to a generous people. She was at Calais, on her way to London, on the 5th of June, and the intelligence was conveyed to Whitehall by telegraph. A cabinet council was assembled hereupon, and it sat through nearly the whole night. On the next morning—the morning of the 6th—the king went in state to give the royal assent to such bills as had passed parliament, and this being done he left Lord Liverpool to deliver the following message to the lords: "The king thinks it necessary, in consequence of the arrival of the queen, to communicate to the house of lords certain papers respecting the conduct of her majesty since her departure from this kingdom, which he recommends to the immediate and serious attention of this house."

The papers referred to were laid on the table in a green bag, which was sealed. This was the famous green bag which made such a figure in the chronicles of the day. A similar message was delivered to the commons by Lord Castlereagh. Both ministers announced the intention to move an address to the king, and to refer the papers to a secret committee on the following day. The lords were silent; but in the commons there was some vehement debate.

[1890 A.D.]

On the 7th Lord Liverpool proposed that the papers should be submitted to a secret committee of fifteen peers, to be appointed by ballot. Lord Liverpool, however, announced that the course to be pursued against the queen could not be an impeachment for treasonable conspiracy, seeing that Bergami, the alleged partner in her guilt, being an alien, was not amenable as a traitor to the crown of England, and that to constitute conspiracy there must be at least two criminals. The secret committee was appointed by ballot on the following day.

While this was passing in the lords there was another vehement debate in the commons. Mr. Brougham presented a message from the queen, which set forth that she had come to claim her rights and maintain her innocence; that she protested against a secret tribunal appointed by her accusers; and finally, that she appealed to the justice of the house of commons. Lord Castlereagh declared that ministers were neither persecutors nor prosecutors in this matter, and that the illustrious personage would not and could not be judged without an open inquiry and examination of witnesses. Mr. Canning, who entertained a kind and generous feeling towards the princess, solemnly vowed that he would never place himself in the situation of her accuser. The same eminent orator and statesman declared that he would take no further share in these deliberations; and, finding the cabinet resolved to proceed, he very soon resigned his office. Mr. Wilberforce moved the adjournment of the question to the next day but one, in the hope that during the interval some amicable arrangement would prevent a disgusting investigation, which might go far to taint the public morals, and which could not but degrade the two contending parties—the king as well as the queen. This motion was agreed to, and for several days there was silence in the house upon the subject.

Caroline of Brunswick had landed at Dover from the ordinary packet on the 6th, accompanied by Alderman Wood and Lady Ann Hamilton. Her entry into London was a kind of triumph, for she was received with joyful acclamations by the common people, and an immense mob followed her carriage, shouting, "The queen forever!" and heaping vituperations and curses upon the heads of her husband's ministers. On the 14th the somewhat radically composed common council of the city of London presented an address, congratulating her majesty on her arrival in the country. The example was speedily followed, and for many months the metropolis was kept in a ferment by addresses and processions, got up by all manner of people, of trades, and of bodies corporate and not corporate, in honour of the queen's happy return.¹

The secret committee of the lords made its report on the 4th of July. The report declared that the evidence affecting the honour of the queen was such as to require, for "the dignity of the crown, and the moral feeling and honour of the country," a "solemn inquiry," which might "be best effected in the course of a legislative proceeding, the necessity of which," the committee declared, "they cannot but most deeply deplore." The queen the next day declared, by petition to the lords, her readiness to defend herself, and prayed to be heard by counsel, in order to detail some weighty matters, which it was necessary to state in preparation for the inquiry. Her petition was refused, and Lord Liverpool proceeded to propose the Bill of Pains and Penalties, which is the everlasting disgrace of his administration. The bill

[¹ "It is not our intention," says Knight,^a "to furnish even the very briefest abstract of the evidence that was brought forward to sustain, or to rebut, the charge against the queen upon which the Bill of Pains and Penalties was founded—namely, that her royal highness conducted herself towards Bartolomeo Bergami, a foreigner engaged in her service in a mental

[1830 A.D.]

was entitled "An act to deprive her majesty, Queen Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, of the title, prerogatives, rights, privileges and exemptions of queen consort of this realm, and to dissolve the marriage between his majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth." It charged the queen with improper and degrading conduct generally during her residence abroad, and particularly with an adulterous connection with a menial servant, named Bartolomeo Bergami; and provided for her degradation and divorce. It was read a first time, and copies were ordered to be sent to the queen, and to her attorney and solicitor-general. The next day her majesty offered to the house of lords her protest, and a renewed prayer to be heard by counsel. Her counsel were called in, and instructed to confine themselves to the subject of the mode of procedure under the bill. The substance of their demand was that the whole business, if not dropped, should be proceeded with, without any delay, to a final issue. Brougham declared that her majesty "was clamorous" for this.

The second reading of the bill was fixed for the 17th of August, and it was at this stage that the attorney-general adduced the charges on the part of the Crown, and followed them up by the testimony of witnesses. From this day to the 8th of September the house of lords was occupied with the testimony offered on behalf of the bill. And it was not only that house that was thus occupied. Nothing else was heard of throughout the country—one might almost say throughout Europe. From day to day indecent tales were told by a party of Italian domestics—tales such as, at other times, are only whispered by the dissolute in private and are never offered to the eye or ear of the moral and modest who compose the bulk of the English nation. These tales were now translated by interpreters at the bar of the house of lords, given in full in the newspapers, and spread through every town, hamlet, and lone house within the four seas. The advisers of the king said much of what the queen had done for the tainting of public morals and the degradation of the dignity of the crown; but it was plain to most people then, and is to every one now, that nothing that it was in her power to do, if she had been all that her prosecutors declared, could have so injured public morals and degraded the crown as the king's conduct in pursuit of his divorce. If he had obtained it, it would have been at the cost of a responsibility towards his people, the weight of which could have been borne by no man worthy to occupy a throne.

It was a season of extreme heat. Horses dropped dead on the roads, and labourers in the fields. Yet, along the line of the mails, crowds stood waiting in the burning sunshine for news of the trial, and horsemen galloped over hedge and ditch to carry the tidings. In London the parks and the West-end streets were crowded every evening; and through the bright nights of July neighbours were visiting one another's houses to lend newspapers or compare rumours. The king was retired within his palace—unable to come forth without danger of meeting the queen, or of hearing cheers in her favour. She had her two-o'clock dinner parties—"Dr. Parr and a large party,"—now a provincial mayor, now a country baronet, now a popular clergyman come up to tender his own homage and that of his neighbours—and then came the appearance to the people in an airing, and on other days the going down to the house of lords. Elsewhere were the Italian witnesses—guarded like a

situation, both in public and private, 'with indecent and offensive familiarity and freedom, and carried on with him a licentious, disgraceful, and adulterous intercourse.' The impression of the character of the queen, produced upon all impartial persons by the publication of the evidence, was pretty much the same as that expressed by Sydney Smith "after the proceedings had closed:—'The style of manners she has adopted does not exactly tally with that of holy women in the days that are gone, but let us be charitable and hope for the best.'"

[1820 A.D.]

gang of criminals as they went to and fro; pelted and groaned at wherever they were seen; driven fast to back doors of the house of lords, and pushed in, as for their lives. Within the house there was the earnest attention of the lords to the summing up of the solicitor-general (Copley), previous to the production of the witnesses, the rushing out to see the eclipse when the pith and marrow of the matter were disposed of, and the rushing back presently during the mingling of his voice at the close with the sound of "the drums and flourish, announcing the queen's arrival"; and then the reception of her majesty, all standing as she entered and took her seat, as hitherto, on "the crimson chair of state, three feet from the bar"; and then the swearing-in of the interpreter, and the introduction of the first witness, at whose entrance the queen was looking another way, but on perceiving whom she uttered an inarticulate exclamation and hastily retired. She had nothing to fear from this witness, however; for his evidence was, on the face of it, so ludicrously untrustworthy that his name, Majocchi, became a joke throughout the country. The poor wretch was an admirable theme for the mob outside in the intervals between their exhortations to the guards, and the peers, and all who passed to the house, to "remember their queen"—"remember their sisters," their "wives," their "daughters." Then there was the perplexity of underlings how to act. The sentinels at Carlton palace, "after a momentary pause, presented arms" as her majesty's carriage passed; "the soldiers at the treasury did not." Daily was the fervent "God bless her!" repeated ten thousand times, from the nearest housetop to the farthest point of vision; and daily did the accused appear "exhausted by fatigue and anxiety," on returning from hearing or being informed of the disgusting charges, the time for replying to which had not yet arrived. Those who remembered that July and August, when men's minds were fevered with passion or enthusiasm, and the thermometer was ranging from 80 to 90 degrees in the shade, could always be eloquent about the summer of 1820.

On the 9th of September her majesty's counsel applied for and obtained an adjournment to Tuesday, the 3rd of October. The defence consisted of attempts, generally successful, to overthrow the credit of the witnesses against the accused, and in bringing forward testimony in favour of her conduct and manners while abroad. On the 2nd of November the arguments of counsel on both sides being concluded, the lords proceeded to discuss the question of the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties. The division was taken on Monday the 6th, when the majority in favour of the second reading was only 28 in a house of 218. On the third reading, which took place four days afterwards, the majority was reduced to 9. Such a result in this house, the stronghold of ministerial power, at once showed the government that it must yield, and that it would yield, "considering the state of public feeling, and the division of sentiment just evinced by their lordships," Lord Liverpool announced on the spot. The king's ministers had come to the determination not to proceed further with the measure.

The joy which spread through the country with the news of the abandonment of the bill was beyond the scope of record. Among the generality of persons who did not look beyond the interest of the particular case, the escape of the queen was a matter of congratulation; but to this persons of more reflection and a more comprehensive knowledge added a deeper joy. They felt as Lord Erskine did when he burst forth with his rejoicings on the announcement of the abandonment of the bill. "My life, whether it has been for good or for evil, has been passed under the sacred rule of the law. In this moment I feel my strength renovated by that rule being restored. The ac-

cursed change wherewithal we had been menaced has passed over our heads. There is an end of that horrid and portentous excrescence of a new law, retrospective, iniquitous, and oppressive; and the constitution and scheme of our polity is once more safe. My heart is too full of the escape we have just had to let me do more than praise the blessings of the system we have regained."

Three nights of illumination in London, sanctioned by the lord mayor, followed the announcement of the triumph of the queen's cause. Prince Leopold, the son-in-law of both the royal parties, ordered Marlborough House to be illuminated; and no abode shone more brightly. The witnesses for the prosecution were burned in effigy in the streets; and there was some mobbing of the newspaper offices which had taken the government side in the question; but there was no serious breach of the peace.

On the 23rd the queen sent down a message to the house of commons, which Mr. Denman had begun to read, when he was stopped by the summons to the commons to attend the house of lords, which preceded the prorogation of parliament. The contents of the message were, of course, made known. Her majesty had declined offers of money and a residence, made by the government since the dropping of the prosecution; and she commended herself to the house of commons, for a due provision, and for protection, in case of a resumption, under some other form, of the proceedings against her—an event strongly apprehended by herself, and by some others more fitted to exercise a cool judgment.

Addresses were presented to the queen from all parts of the country and almost all descriptions of people. On the 29th of November she went in procession to St. Paul's, to return thanks for her deliverance from a great peril and affliction. Her reception was everything that could be wished, as far as the conduct of the vast multitude was concerned; and they did honour to her by the utmost propriety of bearing; but, within the cathedral, we stumble upon an incident characteristic of that time, but scarcely credible in ours. "In the general 'thanksgiving,' the officiating clergyman, Mr. Hayes, one of the minor canons of St. Paul's, omitted the particular thanksgiving which, at the request of any parishioner, it is customary to offer up, and which it was understood her majesty desired might be offered up for her on the present occasion. It is said that Hayes refused, on the ground that the rubric directs that those may be named as returning thanks who have been previously prayed for; but that the queen, not having been prayed for, could not be named in the thanksgiving." Thus the same interdict which deprived her of the prayers of the nation, wrought to prevent her from returning thanks—a privilege which is commonly supposed to be the right of every worshipper within the Christian pale. The life of this unhappy lady offers but little more for record; for the life itself was drawing to a close."^m

PARLIAMENTARY REFORMS OF 1831 A.D.

The parliament of 1821 which commenced its session on the 23d of January, was characterised by the exhibition of a new spirit. An important proceeding was the introduction of the subject of parliamentary reform, which had been dinned into the ears of the legislature by the long and loud outcry from without, and which could no longer be safely neglected. One motion on the subject, which defeated itself by its own violence, was that of Mr. Lambton (afterwards Lord Durham), who proposed to divide the kingdom into elective districts, extend the franchise to every householder, and limit

[1821 A.D.]

the duration of parliaments to three years. Another, and a more moderate one, was that of Lord John Russell, who proposed to extend the right of election to the more populous towns that were still unrepresented, and to disfranchise every borough which might thereafter be convicted of corruption. It was lost, indeed, but the subject itself was too firmly implanted to be rooted out, and after years of blight and storm it was to produce the desired fruits. An earnest even already was afforded of this result, by the disfranchisement of the borough of Grampound, from which the right of election was transferred to the county of York. It was a most important feature in the history of this session that the cause of parliamentary reform had commenced in it. Another question which in like manner was to wait its time, and be successful at last, was that of Catholic emancipation, which was brought forward by Mr. Plunkett on the 28th of February, and supported by Canning. It consisted of two bills, one for repealing Roman Catholic disabilities; the other, for securing the safety of the Protestant church, and the Protestant succession to the crown. They were thrown out in the lords, chiefly through the protest of the duke of York, the presumptive heir to the throne. "Educated," said his royal highness, "in the principles of the established church, the more I inquire, and the more I think, the more I am persuaded that her interests are inseparable from those of the constitution. I consider her as an integral part of that constitution; and I pray that she may long remain so. At the same time, there is no man less an enemy to toleration than myself; but I distinguish between the allowance of the free exercise of religion, and the granting of political power." By these sentiments the duke took the place of his venerated father, and was recognised as the head of those who were opposed to Catholic emancipation.

CORONATION OF GEORGE IV; DEATH OF THE QUEEN

While these important parliamentary proceedings were going forward, the tables of both houses continued to be inundated with petitions in behalf of the queen. The opening speech had recommended a suitable provision to be made for her, instead of that which she had enjoyed as princess of Wales; but she had expressed her firm determination to accept of no settlement while her name was omitted in the liturgy. Not deterred by this declaration, £50,000 had been voted to her for life; and after some demur, the pressure of poverty prevailed; she consented to accept the boon, and by doing so lost much of that popularity which her previous rejection had procured for her. But the coronation, which her arrival had delayed, must now be solemnised at every risk, for George IV valued the pomp of royalty more than even its power, and he could not feel himself "every inch a king" until his head had been surmounted by the crown. The 19th of July was therefore fixed for the pageant; and here the queen had determined to take her final stand. On the 25th of June, she lodged her claim to be crowned, like her royal predecessors, and her claim was ably supported by her law advisers, Messrs. Brougham and Denman; but after a long antiquarian and historical exploration, it was found that the coronation of a king did not necessarily imply that of his consort, and that since the reign of Henry VIII only six out of thirteen queen consorts had been crowned; so that, on the strength of these precedents, her claim as a right was rejected. Caroline then wrote to Lord Sidmouth, stating her determination to be present at the ceremony, and desiring that a suitable place should be provided for her accommodation; and when this was refused, she made a similar application to the duke of Norfolk

as earl-marshal of England, but with the same result. Rejected in these appeals, she now tried one that looked like downright insanity: she requested the archbishop of Canterbury to crown her alone on the following week, while the Abbey of Westminster was in preparation for the final ceremony, which could be done without further national expense. But to her letter containing such a singular request, the astonished primate returned the following brief reply: "The archbishop of Canterbury has the honour to acknowledge with all humility the receipt of her majesty's communication. Her majesty is undoubtedly aware that the archbishop cannot stir a single step in the subject matter of it without the commands of the king."

The coronation took place, with unwonted splendour and magnificence, on the 19th of July. The queen resolved to be present, or to make a scene by seeking admittance in the eyes of the people. It is said that the more prudent of her friends endeavoured to dissuade her; but it is to be apprehended that most of those who surrounded her, and who were making use of her merely for party or factious purposes, without any regard to the shock her feelings might sustain, strongly urged her to go down to the Abbey. She went, and stopping before the Abbey door, was there refused admittance by the door-keepers and military officers on guard. She then wandered round the Abbey walls, in a vain search of some other entrance, and having thus exhibited her humiliation, she retired through the dense multitude, applauded by some, but hissed and hooted and called foul names by others. It has been concluded that this was her death-blow; but for many months she had been living in a state of excitement sufficient to kill a younger and stronger woman. She expired at Brandenburg House on the 7th of August; having directed that her only epitaph should be—"Here lies Caroline of Brunswick, the injured queen of England." Blood was shed almost over her coffin. Ministers had ordered that the funeral procession, which was to proceed from Brandenburg House towards Harwich (where the body was to be embarked for Brandenburg), should make a circuit, in order to avoid passing through the populous parts of London, where some rioting was to be feared. On arriving at Kensington, the procession, finding every road but that leading through London blocked up or barricaded by the mob, was obliged to take part of the forbidden route, intending, however, to get into the high north road by passing through Hyde Park. The park gate by Apsley House was found closed and barricaded, but it was soon forced open by the military; and, followed by a rabble, the funeral procession moved up to the Cumberland gate of the park. This upper gate was also barricaded and the mob seemed to be determined to prevent its being opened, for they stood in a dense mass behind their barricade, and some of them threw stones and pieces of brick-bat at the soldiery. A conflict ensued, in which two of the mob were shot dead on the spot—one by a common soldier, and one by an officer of the guards. The gate being at length forced open, the procession would have moved along the Edgeware road, and have soon reached the quiet open country; but the mob renewed the conflict with a very unusual show of resoluteness; their shouts and shrieks were terrific; and to prevent bloodshed, the directing civil magistrate, Sir Richard Birnie, after consulting with some of the military, gave orders that the mob should have their own way. The corpse was then borne right through London, and no very serious mischief happened. But the government forthwith dismissed Sir Richard Birnie, and also deprived that distinguished officer, Sir Robert Wilson, of his commission in the army, for having remonstrated with some soldiers and an officer on duty. Sir Robert's disgrace or deprivation continued until the accession of William IV.

[1691-1699 A.D.]

THE KING VISITS IRELAND, HANOVER, AND SCOTLAND

After the coronation the king was impatient to visit the more distant parts of his dominions; and on the 11th of August—four days after the queen's decease—he set sail for Ireland, and landed at Howth on the following afternoon. His arrival threw the Irish into a delirium of loyalty, and they hoped all kinds of impossible blessings from the event, of which boundless plenty and uninterrupted peace occupied the foreground. It is needless to add how their hopes were disappointed, and how the reaction only deepened the general poverty and disorder. Heralded by shouting mobs, and scattering his smiles and compliments among all classes, he entered Dublin on the 17th; and when the accounts reached him of the riots at the funeral procession of the queen, he expressed himself in no gentle terms about his ministers for not making better arrangements for the maintenance of the public tranquillity. The king left Ireland on the 7th of September, after making a proclamation exhorting the people to mutual agreement; but at his departure the national disturbances were resumed with double violence, while this unmeaning visit was blamed by the Irish as the cause of their sufferings and misfortunes.

After resting a few days in London, George IV embarked at Gravesend on the 20th of September, to visit his Hanoverian dominions, the capital of which he entered on the 11th of October, after travelling from Calais, where he landed, through Lisle, Brussels, Osnaburg, and Nieburg. Here he spent ten days, and here also he enjoyed the pleasures of a second coronation; while he secured the affections of his German subjects by adopting their manners and using their language, so that, unaccustomed to such royal condescension from their former sovereigns, they regarded him as the *beau idéal* of a patriot king.

The visit of George IV to Scotland, viewed as a conciliary act of royalty, was of greater importance than political calculations could have promised. It gratified the national pride of the Scots, and roused their old feudal affections for the descendant and representative of their ancient dynasty of kings. It edged anew the loyalty of the well-affected, and abated the rancour of political discontent and the extravagances of radical reform. No king had visited their bleak and barren land since the undesirable advent of Charles I in 1617; and on account of this neglect it was felt as if Scotland was unthought of, or merely regarded as an English province or county. When tidings, therefore, arrived that their sovereign was about to visit them, every town, village, and hamlet—the remotest of Scottish isles and the most secluded of Highland straths—were roused at the intelligence, and all poured forth their populations into the ancient capital of the kingdom to grace his court and welcome his arrival. It was an occasion on which the regal bearing and frank debonair manner of George IV had their fairest field for action, and the people forgot his faults and follies in the elegance with which he played his part and the cordiality with which he received their enthusiastic homage.

On the 14th of August the royal yacht and its accompanying war vessels cast anchor in Leith Roads, and on the following day the king landed and went in state to Edinburgh and to the home of his ancestors, the venerable palace of Holyrood; while not only every street, window, and house-top, but the neighbouring fields, Arthur's Seat, Salisbury Crags, the Calton Hill, might be said to contain the population of the kingdom itself, who with a nation's universal voice welcomed his coming among them. It was a reception such as might well compensate for the scoffs and groans of the London

[1832-1833 A.D.]

mobs. During his sojourn of a fortnight in Scotland, the king, who took up his residence in Dalkeith Palace, within six miles of Edinburgh, held frequent levees at Holyrood, and in that brief space he purchased an amount of popularity which years of substantial favours, if churlishly accorded, would have failed to secure. Nor was this visit without its substantial benefits, independently of the public impulse it had imparted. Several of the Scottish peerages had been attained through the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, and their hereditary owners were still in the condition of commoners, through the errors of their grandfathers and great-grandfathers. But now their case was taken into account, and in the following year the attainders were reversed, by which they were restored to the rank of nobility. It was a boon happily selected by its appeal to the ancient feudality and historical remembrances of Scotland—feelings to which her people clung the more intensely, that they still formed part and parcel of their national identity. Another gift fully as national was accorded during the same year. From the wide extent of the Highlands, and the smallness of the population, the parish churches were few and far between, so that many persons found it difficult to partake in the public ordinances of religion, and whole families were utterly deprived of them. An act of parliament was accordingly passed in 1823 for the erection of forty or more churches in the more destitute of the Highland localities, with a manse for the minister, and a stipend of £120 a year. In this way the religious and Presbyterian, as well as the patriotic feelings of the Scots, were gratified by the visit of George IV. It was an auspicious introduction to the happy change which was to commence in less than a quarter of a century, when Scotland was to become not a place of casual advent but a home of royalty.

THE PARLIAMENT OF 1833 A.D.

The session of parliament was opened by commission on the 4th of February, and the speech gave general satisfaction. This was especially the case when his majesty declared that he would be no party to those proceedings of the congress of Verona which sanctioned the interference of foreigners with the internal affairs of Spain, and that he would use his best endeavours to avert the calamities of war between that country and France. But France had decided for war; and the armed *cordon sanitaire* became an army of invasion that crossed the Spanish frontiers for the purpose of suppressing the liberal constitution which the patriots of Spain had enforced upon their king at the sword-point, and for restoring that unworthy Bourbon to all the despotic power which he had so grossly abused. This aggression roused the opposition in the British parliament, more especially as they had hoped that this would be a signal for an armed intervention in behalf of Spain and a remonstrance with the Holy Alliance, by whom the invasion was encouraged. But such interference, besides incurring the risk of a fresh European war, would have been useless for Spain, the bulk of whose population knew nothing about liberty, and preferred the old régime of priestship and kingship. It was necessary in this case for Canning [the secretary for foreign affairs] to explain and justify his principle of non-intervention, and this he did on the 14th of April. He showed how all the attempts of British mediation had failed, and how necessary it was to adopt a system of entire neutrality. He then pointed out the conduct which must be pursued in reference to Portugal and the South American colonies of Spain in the event of certain contingencies. Should Portugal unite with Spain in repelling the French, Britain would have

[1823 A.D.]

no call to interfere; but if Portugal, remaining quiescent, should be attacked, we must then come forward to support the independence of our ancient and faithful ally. As for the South American colonies, it was clear that Spain, though still claiming them, had lost all power over them. If in the course of the war, Canning added, France should capture any of them, so that it became a last question whether they should be ceded, and to whom, it would be necessary for all parties to know the mind of the British government upon the subject, which was to the following effect: that she "considered the separation of the colonies from Spain to have been effected to such a degree that she would not tolerate for an instant any cession which Spain might make of colonies over which she did not exercise a direct and positive influence. To such a declaration the British government had at last been forced."

Having been successful in their Spanish aggressions, which they commenced with doubt and hesitation, the French now contemplated the reconquest of the Spanish-American colonies, for the purpose of restoring them to the dominion of the mother country. But here the forbearance of Britain was at an end, and Canning interposed. "We will not," he said, "interfere with Spain in any attempt which she may make to reconquer what were once her colonies, but we will not permit any third power to attack or reconquer them for her." Accordingly, in October he applied to the French government for an explanation of its intentions regarding these colonies. The answer of the French minister, the prince de Polignac, was in the true spirit of the Holy Alliance school of politics. He could not understand, in the present divided and distracted state of these colonies, what was meant by recognising their independence, and thought that giving such a recognition while there was no solid established government among them, would be nothing less than a real sanction of anarchy. It was for the interest of humanity, he added, and especially of the colonies themselves, that the European governments should concert measures for stilling the contentions of these remote regions, and restoring them to a principle of union in government, whether monarchical or aristocratical. To this the reply of Canning was, "that however desirable the establishment of a monarchical form of government in any of these provinces might be on the one hand, or whatever might be the difficulties in the way of it on the other hand, his government could not take upon itself to put it forward as a condition of their recognition." The hopes of conquest in South America, whether for Spain or herself, which France had entertained, were dispelled, and her warlike preparations for the purpose arrested. Having thus vindicated the right of a people to choose the form of government under which they preferred to live, instead of having one thrust upon them by a foreign power, the British government recognised the independence of these colonies by appointing consuls at their different ports, an example which was soon afterwards followed by the United States of America.¹

During the progress of the deliberations of the British cabinet on the subject of the South American republics, Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States, was addressed by Canning, with a view that the two governments should come to an understanding and join in a concurrent declaration as to the policy to be pursued by them. Mr. Rush,² in a despatch to President Monroe, on the 23rd of August, 1823, says: "The tone of earnestness in Mr. Canning's note naturally starts the inference that the British cabinet cannot be without its serious apprehensions that ambitious enterprises are meditated against the independence of the new Spanish-American States, whether by France alone, or in conjunction with the continental powers, I cannot now say on any authentic grounds." It would seem that, the president having

[1823-1824 A.D.]

made a communication of this despatch to his celebrated predecessor, it was understood by Mr. Jefferson as a proposition by Mr. Canning, that Great Britain should unite with America in an armed resistance to the possible attempt of the allied powers to intrench upon the independence of the infant republics. Mr. Jefferson considered this as the most momentous question that had been ever offered to his contemplation since that of their own independence. The venerable ex-president appears at once to have thrown aside the prejudices against Great Britain which had sometimes marked his official career. "Great Britain" [he is reported by Tucker^a as saying] "is the nation that can do us the most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side, we need not fear the Old World. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause."

STEPS TOWARDS FREE TRADE (1823-1826 A.D.)

In January, 1823, Mr. Huskisson became president of the board of trade. He was held to be a political adventurer, and it was not till 1825 that his great talents and vast financial and commercial knowledge gave him a seat in the cabinet. Liverpool, in 1823, had not hesitated to accept in Mr. Huskisson, as its representative, a second political adventurer. In 1816 Mr. Canning had told his constituents that he pleaded guilty to the heavy charge that had been made against him that he was an adventurer. "A representative of the people, I am one of the people, and I present myself to those who choose me, only with the claims of character, be they what they may, unaccredited by patrician patronage." The talent and knowledge of Mr. Huskisson soon rendered him the highest official authority in his own walk, in spite of Lord Eldon's dislike of this colleague and his principles, "looking to the whole history of this gentleman." In the session of 1823 Mr. Huskisson developed a broader system of commercial policy than any previous government had dared to propose, in opposition to the prejudices of generations—to the belief that the prosperity of the commerce and manufactures of Great Britain rested upon the exclusive employment of her own shipping, upon prohibitory duties, upon restrictive duties almost amounting to prohibition, and upon the balance of trade. Mr. Wallace and Mr. Robinson had taken some steps towards commercial freedom, but Mr. Huskisson, by rapid strides, advanced towards the completion of a healthier system than had as yet prevailed in the world. In 1823 he carried through parliament a measure known as the Reciprocity of Duties Bill, the object of which was that duties and drawbacks should be imposed and allowed on all goods equally, whether imported or exported in British or in foreign vessels; but reserving the power of continuing the existing restrictions with respect to those countries which should decline to act upon a system of reciprocity. The bill was passed on the 4th of July. On that occasion Mr. Stuart Wortley made a remark which we may now regard somewhat as a prophecy: "So many impolitic restrictions called protections being removed from the trade and shipping, it would be impossible to retain for any considerable time the protection given to agricultural produce."

The measure of 1823, which struck a heavy blow at the old navigation laws, provoked little opposition compared with the clamour against the proposition of Mr. Huskisson, on the 5th of March, 1824, that the prohibitions on the importation of silk manufactures should cease on the 5th of July, 1826; that the duties on raw silk should be largely reduced, and those on

[1823-1824 A.D.]

thrown silk reduced one half. We all now know the value of the great argument which Mr. Huskisson employed: "The system of prohibitory duties, which has been maintained with respect to the silk trade, has had the effect—to the shame of England be it spoken—of leaving us far behind our neighbours in this branch of industry. We have witnessed that chilling and benumbing effect which is always sure to be felt when no genius is called into action, and when we are rendered indifferent to exertion by the indolent security of a prohibitory system. I have not the slightest doubt that if the same system had been continued with respect to the cotton manufacture, it would at this moment be as subordinate in amount to the woollen as it is junior in its introduction into this country."

NEGRO SLAVERY IN THE WEST INDIES.

Negro slavery in the West Indies was the subject of animated debates in the house of commons in 1823 and 1824. The difficult question of negro emancipation in the colonies has been happily settled by a magnificent effort on the part of the government and the people. The curse of slavery no longer exists on a single rood of the vast possessions and dependencies of the British Empire. But this result could not have been attained without the persevering efforts of the same zeal which had accomplished the abolition of the slave trade. A few of the first abolitionists still remained. Younger men had joined their ranks, with the determination to banish slavery from England's colonies, and if possible to unite all Christendom in a league against the hateful traffic, which some states still openly perpetrated and others indirectly encouraged. On the 15th of May, 1823, Mr. Thomas Fowell Buxton moved as a resolution, "That the state of slavery is repugnant to the principles of the British constitution and of the Christian religion, and that it ought to be gradually abolished throughout the British colonies with as much expedition as may be found consistent with a due regard to the well-being of the parties concerned." Mr. Canning met this resolution by proposing other resolutions to the effect that decisive measures should be taken for ameliorating the condition of the slave population of the British colonies; that through such measures the house looked forward to such a progressive improvement in the character of the slave population as might prepare them for a participation in civil rights and privileges. Mr. Canning's proposal was unanimously agreed to by the house. The West Indian interest at home was greatly alarmed. The resident proprietors were in a state of indignant terror when the colonial secretary issued a circular which announced the determination of the British government to interfere between the owner and his slave. This circular contained an absolute prohibition to inflict the punishment of flogging under any circumstances upon female slaves, and a strong recommendation with regard to males that the whip should no longer be carried into the field and there displayed by the driver as the emblem of his authority, or employed as the ready instrument of his displeasure. In most of the West India islands the circular of Lord Bathurst produced only votes of indignation in their local assemblies. In Demerara the court of policy passed regulations in compliance with the instructions of the circular, but the negroes entertained a belief that orders had come from England for their complete emancipation. The government of the colony had previously issued a prohibition against the negroes attending divine service except under certain conditions, in the belief that the sectaries incited them to insubordination. On the 18th of August a rising took place amongst some of the slaves, who imprisoned

[1823-1825 A.D.]

their masters but shed no blood. On the 19th martial law was proclaimed, and under sentences of courts-martial forty-seven negroes were executed, and a great number were tortured by the most merciless flogging. The colony was subjected to martial law for five months. Under this law Mr. John Smith, a missionary of the Independent persuasion, was tried upon a charge of having incited the negroes to revolt, and of having concealed their intention to rise. He was convicted and sentenced to death. The governor did not venture to execute the sentence, but left the decision to the British cabinet, who rescinded the sentence, but decreed Mr. Smith's banishment from the colony. Mr. Brougham brought the whole case before the house of commons, on the 1st of June, 1824. The missionary, who had been cast into a loathsome dungeon in a weak state of health, had died after some weeks of severe suffering. The feeling produced at home was that of pity for the victim, and of indignation at the injustice of the court by which he was tried. The proceedings of this general court-martial, held on the 13th of October, 1823, published by the missionary society, displayed "a series of errors so gross as to mock belief, and of oppressions which are unexampled in the dispensation of English justice." Mr. Brougham, in this memorable debate, uttered a solemn warning to the slaveholders: "Yet a little delay, yet a little longer of this unbearable trifling with the commands of the parent state—and she will stretch out her arm in mercy, not in anger, to those deluded men themselves; exert at last her undeniable authority; vindicate the just right and restore the tarnished honour of the English name!"

FURTHER REFORMS IN THE CRIMINAL LAW; "THE PANIC"

Of the six bills for the repeal of capital punishments which Sir James Mackintosh introduced in the sessions of 1820, three eventually became laws. These were the only formal results of the perseverance of the legislator upon whom the mantle of Romilly had fallen. In 1822 he obtained a pledge from the house that it would proceed to a general consideration of the criminal laws in the next session. On the 21st of May, 1823, he proposed nine resolutions, which went at once to do away with capital punishments in a number of offences to which they referred. Mr. Peel, who was now secretary of state for the home department, objected to the extent of these measures. He admitted the necessity of some amendment, and intimated his intention to propose measures which should embrace several of the improvements which Sir James Mackintosh contemplated. His son has recorded that the defeat on this occasion was a signal to Sir James for surrendering the superintendence of further reforms into the hands of one whose position as a minister gave him peculiar facilities for carrying them into effect: "He lived," says his biographer, "to see the propriety of many of these very alterations acquiesced in to an extent which he dared scarcely have imagined, and which drew from him the expression, instancing the growth of opinion on these subjects, that he could almost think that he had lived in two different countries, and conversed with people who spoke two different languages."

When the session of parliament was opened on the 3rd of January, 1825, the exultation of the royal speech upon "public prosperity" was far stronger than ministerial prudence and reserve often ventured to indulge. "There never was a period in the history of this country when all the great interests of the nation were at the same time in so thriving a condition." Alas, for the instability of human affairs! In the king's speech on the 2nd of February, 1826, we have this sentence: "His majesty deeply laments the injurious

[1825 A.D.]

effects which the late pecuniary crisis must have entailed upon many branches of the commerce and manufactures of the United Kingdom." The pecuniary crisis was, indeed, the most unexpected, the most astounding, and the most severe in its consequences of any derangement of commercial operations ever produced by extravagant hopes and exaggerated alarms. This pecuniary crisis universally obtained the name of the Panic. It was described by Mr. Huskisson as "such a complete suspension of all confidence as, contradistinguished from commercial distress, rendered it impossible to procure money upon even the most unobjectionable security. . . . If the difficulties which existed in the money market had continued only eight-and-forty hours longer, he sincerely believed that the effect would have been to put a stop to all dealings between man and man, except by way of barter."

There can be no doubt whatever that at the beginning of 1825 the sanguine views of the chancellor of the exchequer, which obtained for him the name of "Prosperity Robinson," were really justified by whatever was apparent in the material condition of the country. In June of that year an article appeared in the *Quarterly Review* which went very carefully into the proofs that there had scarcely ever been a time when every branch of industry had been so generally prosperous. We are taken into the country to look upon fields better cultivated than a few years before; barns and stackyards more fully stored; horses, cows, and sheep more abundant; implements of husbandry greatly improved. In cities, towns, and villages, more numerous and better shops, and a vast increase of goods, indicating the flourishing circumstances of the community. In manufactories similar manifestations of the increase of wealth. We are then told that if we could examine the accounts of the bankers of the metropolis, and in the small as well as large provincial towns, we should find that the balances resting with them were increased to an enormous amount. The reviewer then adds: "This indeed may be fairly inferred from the low rate of interest in the floating public securities, from the prices of the funds, from the avidity with which every project for the employment of capital is grasped at, and from the general complaint, almost the only complaint heard, that there is now no way of making interest for money." Those who in all times are ready to treat such maladies in the body politic by salutary venesection, were most busy and successful at the end of 1824 and the beginning of 1825. Joint-stock companies suddenly rose up, some for provident schemes of home industry, but others holding forth the prospect of enormous wealth by working the mines of South America. "All the gambling propensities of human nature [says the *Annual Register*] were constantly solicited into action, and crowds of individuals of every description—the credulous and the suspicious—the crafty and the bold—the raw and the experienced—the intelligent and the ignorant—princes, nobles, politicians, placemen, patriots, lawyers, physicians, divines, philosophers, poets, intermingled with women of all ranks and degrees—spinsters, wives, and widows—hastened to venture some portion of their property in schemes of which scarcely anything was known except the name."

The South American mining schemes required large remittances in money, and an equal expenditure in stores and machinery for the operations to be carried on. The new South American states asked and obtained considerable loans. Speculations in goods were carried forward to an extent, and with a temporary amount of profit, previously unknown. The rush of purchasers to invest in coffee, in spices, in indigo, in tallow, and in cotton, with a total ignorance of everything connected with the relation of the supply to the consumption, had for a while the effect of producing a general rise of prices.

[1825 A.D.]

Every article which had not advanced in price was soon made the subject of an exaggerated demand. Very soon after parliament had separated, cheered by the official announcement of public prosperity, a reaction commenced. The price of every article that had been the subject of this overtrading began to fall. More precipitous was the downward tendency of the loan and share market; for no dividends came from the South American loans; no remittances in the precious metals to attest that increased productiveness of the mines which was expected to arise out of the application of British capital and machinery. The rage for speculation had so penetrated into uncommercial circles, and the sober tradesman who once used to be content with the moderate profits of his own industry had so embarked his capital in rash ventures, that, when a want of confidence began to be felt, universal distrust soon succeeded. The Bank of England, which had £10,000,000 of bullion and coin in its coffers in April, had only £1,300,000 in November to meet the rapid drain that was going forward. The directors of the Bank of England, in their alarm, suddenly diminished their circulation to the extent of £3,500,000. In the general want of confidence, the country bankers had to endure the consequences of an almost unlimited circulation of their notes, nothing loath as they had been to assist the speculative tendencies of their customers by what seemed a method so easy to themselves. The time was at hand when every man would look suspiciously upon the dirty pieces of paper which he had held to be as good as gold; and these promises to pay would travel, first slowly and then rapidly, to the banker's counter, and many who saw these obligations return to their source would ask what they had done to provoke this run upon them. In London those large balances in the hands of the bankers which the reviewer described as "ready to embrace favourable changes in the price of any commodity, or to be placed at interest as beneficial securities presented themselves," were suddenly withdrawn to meet unforeseen losses, to satisfy unexpected demands, and, in many cases, out of a selfish mistrust of the security of those depositories which had once justly received the public confidence. Selfish and short-sighted was the panic that drove men to the banker's counter, in their ignorant belief that it was his duty to have ready in his till an amount sufficient to pay the balances of every customer. On the 5th of December the banking house of Sir Peter Pole and Company stopped payment. On the 6th the bank of Williams and Company followed.

During the three weeks of alarm and misery which preceded the Christmas of 1825, the cabinet was daily deliberating upon measures to be pursued to stop the disorder and to mitigate its consequences. The bank directors came forward to lend money upon any description of property; and relaxed all their accustomed regulations for the discount of bills. The amount of mercantile bills under discount had been four millions on the 3rd of November; it had increased to fifteen millions on the 29th of December. Sovereigns were coined at the mint at the unprecedented speed of one hundred and fifty thousand daily. At the Bank of England notes were printed with equal promptitude; for with the sanction of the cabinet it was determined that one- and two-pound notes which the Bank of England had called in should again be issued for temporary purposes. Still these two supplies of an unexceptionable currency could not be produced fast enough to fill up the vacuum occasioned by the almost total withdrawal of country bank paper. An accidental circumstance solved the difficulty. A box containing about seven hundred thousand pounds of one-pound notes, which had been put aside unused, was accidentally discovered at the bank. Mr. Harman, one of the

[1825-1826 A.D.]

directors, stated it as his opinion [as quoted by Porter ⁷] that the timely issue of these notes "worked wonders—it saved the credit of the country."

When the session of parliament was opened on the 2nd of February, 1826, it was truly said in the royal speech that some of the causes of the evil which had occurred were beyond the reach of direct parliamentary interposition, nor could security against the recurrence of them be found unless in the experience of the sufferings which they had occasioned. But to a certain portion of the evil correctives at least, if not effectual remedies, might be applied. It was desirable to place on a more firm foundation the currency and circulating credit of the country. Lord Liverpool then stated the measures which government intended to submit for the consideration of parliament. One of those measures was a regulation by which one- and two-pound banknotes should be gradually withdrawn from circulation, and a metallic currency substituted for them. The other measure had reference to the exclusive privileges of the Bank of England, under their charter which would not expire till 1833. Lord Liverpool said, if the bank could be induced to give up so much of their exclusive privilege as related to country banks, and if they would accompany that surrender with a measure which would be desirable for their own sakes, namely the establishment in some parts of the country of branches of their own institution, the effect on the general circulation of the country would, he thought, be most beneficial. The privilege of the Bank of England had prevented the establishment of any banking concern with a greater number of partners than six. Lord Liverpool said he was old enough to remember the time when there was scarcely such an institution as a country bank except in great commercial towns, and when the transactions of the country were carried on in Bank of England notes, and money obtained from London. There had been a great change. Any small tradesman, a cheesemonger, a butcher, or a shoemaker might open a country bank. The exclusive privilege of the Bank of England did not touch them. But an association of persons with fortune sufficient to carry on a banking concern with security was not permitted to do so. The panic of 1825 produced the great measure of 1826, sanctioning the establishment of joint-stock banks; under which enactment a banking firm might include any number of partners except within sixty-five miles of London. This year was also the date of the establishment of branch banks of the Bank of England. Scotland was exempted from the prohibition of the small note currency. It is worthy of note that during the panic not a single Scotch bank failed.

THE QUESTION OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

At the close of the session on the 31st of May the royal intention was announced "to dissolve without delay the present parliament." It was the seventh session of that parliament. The dissolution at this early season had no reference to the state of political parties, but simply had regard to the convenience of the time for a general election. The leading question upon which men's minds would be most stirred throughout the kingdom, and especially in Ireland, would be that of Catholic emancipation. The cabinet remained in the position as to this question which it occupied in 1812, when Lord Castlereagh became one of its members. Catholic emancipation was what is called "an open question," upon the principle described by Mr. Canning—"the principle of treating it as a question out of the ordinary course of ministerial business; as one to be argued upon its own merits, such as they

[1826-1827 A.D.]

might appear to each individual member of the administration." Lord Liverpool, as the head of the government, was opposed to the Catholic claims, but his opposition was qualified by the moderation of his character, and no one doubted his sincerity. Lord Eldon [according to his biographer, Twiss] again and again avowed his "firm and determined purpose to support to the last our establishment in church and state." When Mr. Canning became secretary of foreign affairs, he was unpopular with the anti-Catholic party in general, and obnoxious to the lord chancellor in particular. Lord Eldon was, however, consoled by the decided views of Mr. Peel on this subject, whose influence with the anti-Catholic party was materially strengthened by his position as representative of the University of Oxford. Mr. Peel, although then of comparative unimportance as a political leader, was in 1818 preferred by the university as a representative of its orthodoxy, whilst Mr. Canning was rejected. Upon the great "open question," the party of Mr. Canning in the cabinet obtained in 1825 a majority in the house of commons upon a bill for the repeal of disabilities, the enactment of a state provision for the Roman Catholic clergy, and the raising of the qualification of the Irish franchise from forty shillings to ten pounds. The bill passed the commons by a majority of twenty-seven. It was rejected by the lords by a majority of forty-eight. In the session of 1826 the question of Catholic emancipation was not agitated in parliament.

DEATH OF THE DUKE OF YORK AND LORD LIVERPOOL; THE MINISTRY OF CANNING

On the 1st of January, 1827, the death of the duke of York was momentarily expected. The duke died on the 5th. The lord chancellor mourned deeply over the loss of the prince, chiefly because he had great influence with the king, and in correspondence with his majesty upon political questions, and in his recommendation of proper persons to be continued or appointed ministers, was much governed in his judgment by what had been, and what he thought would be, the conduct of each person as to the Catholic claims. This was the one test of fitness for office with the duke of York and with the lord chancellor, who thus recorded their mutual opinions.

On the 16th of February Lord Liverpool moved an address to the king, expressive of the concurrence of the peers in a message recommending a provision for the duke and duchess of Clarence. The next morning the servant of the prime minister, going into his sitting-room after breakfast, found him senseless on the floor in a fit of apoplexy. On the 18th Lord Eldon thus expressed his opinion as to the results of this event: "His life is very uncertain, and it is quite certain that as an official man he is no more. Heaven knows who will succeed him." [Lord Liverpool's death did not occur till about two years later, but he never sufficiently recovered normality of mind even to resign the premiership, which he had held since 1812.]

There was no one to be found, either pro-Catholic or anti-Catholic, who could be placed at the head of the government with the same power and influence as Lord Liverpool had exercised for continuing the system of compromise. Mr. Canning saw the difficulty, and offered to retire if the king could form an administration wholly composed of persons thinking as the king himself thought. His majesty did not see the possibility of maintaining such a ministry; and finally on the 10th of April gave his commands to Mr. Canning to prepare, with as little delay as possible, a plan for the reconstruction of the administration.

[1827 A.D.]

On the 12th of April a new writ for the borough of Newport was moved in the house of commons, in consequence of the acceptance by Mr. Canning of the office of first lord of the treasury. At the same time it was agreed that the house should adjourn till the 1st of May. During this interval the greatest excitement prevailed, not only amongst political partisans, but in every circle in which the characters and opinions of public men formed subjects of discussion. The commanding talents and the liberal policy of Mr. Canning produced a very extended hope that he would be able to maintain his great position against the attacks of his numerous enemies. When the houses met, after the Easter recess, on the 1st of May, Mr. Canning had completed the formation of his ministry. On that day all the avenues to the house of commons were crowded by persons anxious to catch a glimpse of the minister so beloved and trusted, so feared and hated. He walked up the old staircase which led to the lobby with a firm and agile step, and one of the crowd, at least, who looked upon his radiant face, thought of Burke's famous description of Conway, "hope elevated and joy brightened his crest." The house of commons on that night presented an unusual spectacle. Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Tierney sat immediately behind the minister. Mr. Brougham took his seat on the ministerial side, with other members who three weeks previously had sat on the benches of opposition. In the house of peers, Lord Lyndhurst was on the woolsack. Three new peers took the oaths, Viscount Goderich (late Mr. Robinson), Lord Plunkett, and Lord Tenterden. Mr. Peel on that night made a most elaborate exposition of the causes which had led to the resignation of himself and other members of the late government. There was no acrimony in his studied oration. Mr. Canning had the gratifying assurance from Mr. Brougham, who in the eminent position which he had won had the right to speak the sentiments of a large and powerful body, that the new government should have his support, without the possibility of his taking office himself.

During the two months in which the session was continued after the re-assembling of parliament on the 1st of May, the irregular discussions in both houses left but little opportunity for real progress in the nation's business. The personal hostility to Mr. Canning, which the duke of Wellington almost acknowledged, was something strange in parliamentary tactics, and some attributed it to the traditional jealousy of the aristocracy, whether whig or tory, that a plebeian—an adventurer—should presume to take the helm of the state instead of one of their "order." Others ascribed the personal attacks of many peers and commoners to that hatred of genius, too often entertained by mediocrity of understanding. The incessant exhibition of this spirit rendered it impossible for the minister either to make a triumphant display of his oratorical power, or to carry through any measure of great public importance. He spoke for the last time on the 18th of June, on the subject of the corn trade. The session was closed on the 2nd of July.

When men were speculating in February on the probable successor of Lord Liverpool, Lord Eldon wrote, "I should suppose Canning's health would not let him undertake the labour of the situation; but ambition will attempt anything." The prorogation of parliament did not produce the usual effect of comparative relaxation upon the toil-worn minister. Four years previous, Mr. Canning, Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Robinson were described after a prorogation as "boys let loose from school." The American minister, who was thus astonished at the deportment of grave statesmen, was more astonished when the secretary for foreign affairs, after dinner, proposed that the company should play at the game of "twenty questions." Complete relaxation,

[1827 A.D.]

however impaired may be the health of a prime minister, is one of the few things which he is utterly powerless to command. Mr. Canning had an interview with the king on the 30th of July, when his majesty was so struck by the looks of the premier, to whom he had given a cordial support, that he sent his own physician to attend him. The next day Mr. Canning had to work in Downing street. The duke of Devonshire had lent him his villa at Chiswick, in the belief that change of air would restore him. He occupied the bedroom in which Fox had died. On the 31st a few friends had dined with him; but he retired early. The suffering from internal inflammation which he felt on that last night of July terminated in his death on the 8th of August. He was buried in Westminster abbey on the 16th in the most private manner. But the universal display of sorrow told more than any funereal pomp that a great man had departed.

ENGLAND AND GREEK INDEPENDENCE (1827 A.D.)

The settlement of a treaty between Great Britain, France, and Russia, on the subject of the affairs of Greece, was the latest, as it was amongst the most important, of the official acts of Mr. Canning. That treaty was signed on the 7th of July, 1827. Forty years had elapsed since, a schoolboy at Eton, he had written a very eloquent poem on *The Slavery of Greece*. He painted the ancient glories of her arms and her arts; he evoked the great names of her philosophers and her poets, to point the contrast of her glories fading into shame—servitude binding in its galling chain those who had stood up against Asia's millions—cities mouldering—the fallen column on the dusty ground—worst of all, the sons of the freedom-breathing land sighing in abject bondage, groaning at the labours of the oar or of the mine, trembling before

“The glitt’ring tyranny of Othman’s sons.”

The position of Greece since 1821 was such as to arouse the deepest sympathies of every Englishman who knew anything of her ancient story. The Greeks in that year, seizing the opportunity of a war between the sultan and Ali Pasha, rose in revolt. A proclamation issued by the archbishop of Patras produced a general insurrection. For six years a cruel and devastating war had gone on, in which the Greeks, at first successful, had more and more quailed before the greater force which the Porte was able at last to bring against them by employing the disciplined troops of the pasha of Egypt. The story of this war has a peculiar interest to us in connection with the individual efforts of Englishmen to promote this struggle for freedom—of Byron, who died at Missolonghi with “Greece” on his lips—of Cochrane, whose hopes of rousing the Greek leaders to decisive and unanimous action came to an end when all was lost at the great battle before Athens. In September, 1826, the divan having obstinately refused to enter into negotiations with those over whom they considered themselves the absolute masters—those “who form part of the nations inhabiting the countries conquered ages ago by the Ottoman arms”—the British government proposed to Russia that the Porte should be apprised that the result of this obstinacy would be the recognition of the independence of Greece. What, according to international laws, should be the basis of this recognition, was clearly laid down by Mr. Canning. The Turks were to be told that Great Britain and Russia “would look to Greece with an eye of favour, and with a disposition to seize the first occasion of recognising, as an independent state, such portion of her territory as should have freed itself from Turkish dominion; provided that such state should have shown itself substantially capable of maintaining an independent

[1827 A.D.]

existence, of carrying on a government of its own, of controlling its own military and naval forces, and of being responsible to other nations for the observance of international laws and the discharge of international duties." Such was the exposition which the British government then adopted, in the affairs of Greece, of the principles which should determine the recognition of the independence of a revolting or separating state. The principle of what should constitute a belligerent was laid down with equal clearness by Mr. Canning at an earlier stage of this conflict: "The character of belligerency is not so much a principle as a fact. A certain degree of force and consistency acquired by any mass of population engaged in war entitles that population to be treated as a belligerent, and even if their title were questionable renders it the interest, well understood, of all civilised nations so to treat them. For what is the alternative? A power or community (whichever it may be called) which is at war with another, and which covers the sea with its cruisers, must either be acknowledged as a belligerent or treated as a pirate."

Upon the conclusion of the treaty of July, 1827, it was agreed that instructions should be sent to the representatives at Constantinople of the three contracting powers that they should present a joint declaration to the divan, stating that as the war of extermination had been prolonged for six years, producing results shocking to humanity, and inflicting intolerable injury on the commerce of all nations, it was no longer possible to admit that the fate of Greece concerned exclusively the Ottoman Porte. They were to offer their mediation between the Sublime Porte and the Greeks to put an end to the war, to settle by amicable negotiation the relations which ought for the future to exist between them, and to propose that all acts of hostility should be suspended by an armistice. A similar proposition should be made to the Greeks. A month was to be given to the Ottoman Porte to make known its determination. If no answer were returned, or an evasive answer were given, the divan was to be informed that the three powers would themselves interfere to establish an armistice. Although the admirals of the allied squadrons of the three powers were to be instructed to take coercive measures to enforce an armistice, they were to be warned against any hostile step which would be contrary to the pacific character which the three powers were desirous to impart to their interference.

PREMIERSHIP OF LORD GODERICH; THE BATTLE OF NAVARINO

The death of Mr. Canning placed Lord Goderich at the head of the government. The composition of the cabinet was slightly altered. Mr. Huskisson became colonial secretary, Mr. Herries chancellor of the exchequer. The government was generally considered to be weak, and not calculated for a long endurance. Its greatest accession of strength seemed to be in the acceptance of the office of commander-in-chief by the duke of Wellington. Lord Eldon, in serious apprehension that this appointment committed the duke to the support of the administration, wrote to him a letter which called forth this explanation: "If, on the one hand, the administration have no claim upon my services out of my profession, I, on the other hand, can be of no counsel or party against them." The cabinet of Lord Goderich had not a long existence. It lasted scarcely five months, and it fell through the petty jealousies of some of its members, which gave the finishing blow to the tottering fabric.

On the 10th of November it was known in London that despatches had been received at the admiralty, announcing a great naval battle in the bay of

[1837 A.D.]

Navarino. If the popular belief in omens of national success or disaster had not nearly passed away, the public might have looked with trembling anxiety to these despatches, in the dread that the battle would prove a defeat. For, at the lord mayor's banquet on the 9th of November, a great device of illuminated lamps representing an anchor suddenly fell down upon the dignitaries below, slightly wounding the duke of Clarence and the lord mayor, scattering unwelcome oil over the dresses of the ladies who graced the civic feast, and altogether marring the usual flow of hollow compliment which is so coarsely proffered and so greedily accepted on these occasions. The *Gazette* soon proclaimed that the Turkish fleet had been nearly annihilated; that the flags of England, France, and Russia floated supreme on the shores of the Morea. Nevertheless, politicians shook their heads at what they considered an aggression, which might lead to an interminable war—an aggression which ultra-toryism regarded as particularly objectionable, inasmuch as it crippled the means of a despotic power effectually to crush its rebellious subjects. The Sublime Porte had well learned the lessons taught by the congresses of Troppau and Laybach when it proclaimed, in its manifesto of the previous June, that "Almighty wisdom, in dividing the universe into different countries, has assigned to each a sovereign, into whose hands the reins of absolute authority over the nations subject to his dominion are placed."

When the demand under the Treaty of London, which was made by England, France, and Russia, for an immediate armistice, as a preliminary and an indispensable condition to the opening of any negotiation, was announced by the ambassadors of these powers at Constantinople, the divan declined to recognise any interference with its conduct towards its rebellious subjects. The Greeks readily accepted the armistice proposed by the treaty. Ibrahim Pasha had come from Alexandria with the Egyptian fleet during the period of the discussions at Constantinople. The allied fleets were lying off Navarino, their admirals being without authority to prevent the junction of the Egyptian fleet with the Turkish, already moored in that harbour. The Egyptian commander was informed by Sir Edward Codrington that he might return, if he chose, with a safe-conduct to Alexandria, but that if he entered the harbour he would not be suffered to come out. Ibrahim Pasha made his choice to join the Turkish fleet. On the 25th of September a conference took place between the admirals and Ibrahim Pasha, at which the Egyptian prince entered into a verbal agreement for a suspension of hostilities during twenty days. The English and French commanders, relying upon this agreement, sailed to Zante to obtain fresh provisions. Ibrahim Pasha then came out of the harbour, with the object of carrying his warfare to some other point in the Morea. Sir Edward Codrington met him near Patras with a small force, and compelled him to return. After that, says the protocol of the three admirals, "the troops of the pasha have not ceased carrying on a species of warfare more destructive and exterminating than before, putting women and children to the sword, burning their habitations, and tearing up trees by the roots, in order to complete the devastation of the country." The despatch of Sir Edward Codrington, dated from H.M.S. *Asia*, in the port of Navarino, narrates the subsequent decisive event. The count de Hayden, rear-admiral of Russia, and the French rear-admiral, the chevalier de Rigny, having agreed with him to enter the port in order to induce Ibrahim Pasha to discontinue his brutal war of extermination, took up their anchorage about two o'clock in the afternoon of the 20th of October. The Turkish ships were moored in the form of a crescent. The combined fleet was formed in the order of sailing in two columns, the British and French forming the

[1827-1828 A.D.]

weather or starboard line, and the Russian the lee line. The *Asia* led in, followed by the *Genoa* and *Albion*, and anchored close alongside a ship of the line bearing the flag of the capitana bey.

The stations of the French and Russian squadrons were marked out by the English admiral, who was the chief in command. "I gave orders," says Sir Edward, "that no gun should be fired unless guns were fired by the Turks, and those orders were strictly observed." The three British ships passed the batteries, and moored without any act of hostility on the part of the Turks, although they were evidently prepared for a general action. At the entrance of the harbour were six Turkish fire-vessels, which a portion of the English squadron were appointed to watch. On the *Dartmouth* sending a boat towards one of these vessels her crew was fired upon by musketry. The fire was returned from the *Dartmouth* and *La Syrene*, which bore the flag of Admiral de Rigny. An Egyptian ship then fired a cannon-shot at the French admiral's vessel, which was immediately returned; "and thus," says Sir Edward Codrington, "very shortly afterwards the battle became general." After describing, with the usual indistinctness, the movements of various ships, he comes to the catastrophe. "This bloody and destructive battle was continued with unabated fury for four hours, and the scene of wreck and devastation which presented itself at its termination was such as has been seldom before witnessed." Of the Egyptian and Turkish fleets, which numbered about a hundred and twenty men-of-war and transports, one-half were sunk, burned, or driven on shore. The allied admirals published a notice after the battle, that as they did not enter Navarino with a hostile intention, but only to renew propositions to the commanders of the Turkish fleet, they would forbear from destroying what ships of the Ottoman navy might still remain, "now that so signal a vengeance has been taken for the first cannon-shot which has been ventured to be fired on the allied flags." They threatened that if there were any new act of hostility they would immediately destroy the remaining vessels and the forts of Navarino. The despatch of Sir Edward announcing the victory contains a frank admission that he was not insensible to other feelings than those of professional obedience to his instructions: "When I found that the boasted Ottoman word of honour was made a sacrifice to wanton, savage devastation, and that a base advantage was taken of our reliance upon Ibrahim's good faith, I own I felt a desire to punish the offenders. But it was my duty to refrain, and refrain I did; and I can assure his royal highness [the duke of Clarence] that I would still have avoided this disastrous extremity if other means had been open to me."

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON BECOMES PREMIER (1828 A.D.)

The differences upon financial measures between Mr. Herries, the chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Huskisson, secretary of state for the colonies, could not be reconciled by Lord Goderich, and he therefore tendered his resignation to the king on the 9th of January, 1828. His majesty immediately sent to Lord Lyndhurst to desire that he and the duke of Wellington should come to Windsor. The king told the duke that he wished him to form a government of which he should be the head. "He said that he thought the government must be composed of persons of both opinions with respect to the Roman Catholic question; that he approved of all his late and former servants, and that he had no objection to anybody excepting to Lord Grey." It was understood that Lord Lyndhurst was to continue in office. The duke of Wellington immediately applied to Mr. Peel, who, returning to his post of

[1835 A.D.]

secretary of state for the home department, saw the impossibility of reuniting in this administration those who had formed the cabinet of Lord Liverpool. He desired to strengthen the government of the duke of Wellington by the introduction of some of the more important of Mr. Canning's friends into the cabinet and to fill some of the lesser offices.

On the 29th of January parliament was opened by commission. On the ninth day after the meeting of parliament, Mr. Brougham took that

position which he everafter maintained, of being the most indefatigable and persevering of law reformers. The reformation of the criminal law was no longer opposed, except by a few whose opinions had very speedily come to be considered as worthless as they were obsolete. A commission had been appointed to inquire into abuses in courts of equity. The course of improvement which was open to Mr. Brougham was to promote an inquiry "into the defects occasioned by time and otherwise in the laws of this realm of Eng-



DUKE OF WELLINGTON
(1769-1852)

land, as administered in the courts of common law." Mr. Brougham introduced his motion in a speech of nearly six hours. It has been said of this speech, "its huge length and unwieldy dimensions compelled attention." These are not the qualities which usually compel attention in the house of commons. During that extraordinary exhibition of the rare ability to mass an infinity of details, so as to make each contribute something to the general effect, the attention of the house was uninterruptedly sustained. The first listeners were amongst the last. Whilst the orator exhibited no signs of physical exhaustion, scarcely one of his audience seemed to feel a sense of weariness. The peroration of this great effort of memory and judgment was the only portion that could be properly deemed rhetorical: "It was the boast of Augustus—it formed part of the glare in which the perfidies of his earlier years were lost—that he found Rome of brick, and left it of marble; a praise not unworthy a great prince, and to which the present reign also has its claims. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say, that he found law dear, and left it cheap; found it a sealed book—left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich—left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression—left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence!" On the adjourned debate of the 29th of February, upon Mr. Brougham's proposition

[1828 A.D.]

for a commission, the government, through the law officers and the home secretary, expressed its intention so far to concur in the motion as to consent that separate commissions should issue—one for inquiry into the progress of suits at common law; the other into the state of the laws affecting real property. Mr. Brougham concurring in this alteration, the two commissions were forthwith appointed.

The house of commons was now fairly engaged in the work of improvement. On the motion of Mr. Peel a select committee was appointed to inquire into the public income and expenditure; to consider measures for an effectual control on all charges connected with this receipt and expenditure, and also for reducing the expenditure without detriment to the public service. No one can trace the course of our parliamentary history after the close of the war without feeling how much of the tardy recognition by the government of principles of financial economy was due to the unwearied exertions of Mr. Hume. His views, however they might at times be impracticable, produced as a whole the inevitable triumph of all zealous and continuous labour. Mr. Secretary Peel early in the session proposed another measure which, he said, might at first sight appear limited in its application, and local in its objects, but which was connected with considerations of the highest importance to the well-being of the country. He proposed that a committee should be appointed to inquire into the state of the police of the metropolis. In the next session of parliament Mr. Peel carried his great plan for abolishing the local establishments of nightly watch and police, for forming the metropolitan police district, and for appointing a sufficient number of able men under the direction of the secretary of state to be the police force for the whole of this district. For several years a prodigious clamour was raised against this force, not only by thieves and street-walkers, but by respectable upholders of the ancient watch, and by zealous friends of the nation's freedom, who dreamt that the new police would have the certain effect of depriving us of our immemorial liberties. The new police was to be [as Fonblanque^e says] "the most dangerous and effective engine of despotism." Sensible men were satisfied to believe that Mr. Peel's innovation would have no other effect upon our liberties than that of depriving us "of the liberty we have hitherto enjoyed of being robbed and knocked on the head at discretion of their honours the thieves."

A great parliamentary struggle was at hand in 1828, which was the prelude to a still more important conflict in 1829. This was Lord John Russell's motion, on the 26th of February, for a committee of the whole House to consider of so much of the acts of the 13 and 25 of Charles II as requires persons, before admission into any office in corporations, or having accepted any office civil or military, or any place of trust under the crown, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the practice of the Church of England. The motion was opposed by Mr. Huskisson, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Peel. It was opposed, says Sir Robert Peel in his *Memoirs*,^w "with all the influence and authority of the government recently appointed." Nevertheless, on a division on the motion of Lord John Russell, it was carried by a majority of 44, there being 237 in favour of the motion, and 193 against it. Sir Robert Peel says, in his *Memoirs*, that the administration considered that they should not be justified in abandoning the service of the crown in consequence of this defeat, and farther, that it would have been very unwise hastily to commit the house of lords to a conflict with the house of commons on a question of this nature. Mr. Peel eventually proposed a measure of compromise—that a declaration should be substituted in place of the sacramental test. The bill as amended passed the house of commons and met with very little

[1828 A.D.]

effectual opposition in the house of lords, the two archbishops and three bishops speaking in its favour. Sir Robert Peel says that the conciliatory adjustment of the question was what he earnestly desired; that had any other course been taken by the government the final result of parliamentary discussion would probably have been the same—namely, the repeal of the Test and Corporation acts; and that it may fairly be questioned whether the repeal would have taken place under circumstances more favourable to the true interests of the church, or more conducive to the maintenance of harmony and goodwill amongst the professors of different religious creeds. It was in vain that Lord Eldon described the bill to be “as bad, as mischievous, and as revolutionary as the most captious dissenter could wish it to be.” He nevertheless prophesied truly when he said, “Sooner or later, perhaps in this very year, almost certainly in the next, the concessions to the dissenters must be followed by the like concessions to the Roman Catholics.”

ELECTION FOR CLARE OF DANIEL O'CONNELL

The appointment of Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald to a ministerial office caused a vacancy in the representation of the county of Clare. The contest for this seat produced events in Ireland “of deep importance, especially in their relation to the Catholic question.” Mr. Fitzgerald was a person of great influence in the county of Clare. He had conciliated the Roman Catholics by a constant advocacy in parliament for the removal of their disabilities. Certainly no Protestant could have had a fairer chance of support, not only from the landlords but from their tenantry. Yet the whole power of the Catholic Association was called forth to prevent his return, and to secure the election of Mr. O'Connell, who, by his faith, was disqualified from sitting in parliament. During the short administration of Mr. Canning the association, founded in 1823, had voluntarily dissolved itself, having confidence that the minister would bring forward some effectual measure of relief. The accession to power of the duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, and the subsequent changes in the cabinet which had disturbed the balance of opinions on the greatest question of domestic policy, revived the association with new strength, which was calculated to produce the most serious alarm. Lord Anglesey, the lord lieutenant, had gone to Ireland with the decided opinion that concessions to the Catholics should be refused. What he saw there in the summer of 1828 produced in his mind a conviction of the positive danger of persevering in the old system of policy. Mr. O'Connell, whose power as a demagogue was probably never exceeded by any Irishman or Englishman—gifted with a popular oratory which completely won the hearts of a fervid peasantry—professing the utmost deference to the Catholic priesthood, which he swayed as much by his devotion as a son of the church as by his prompt and versatile ability—wanting perhaps “very determined courage,” but with every other quality for the leader of a rebellion—Mr. O'Connell stirred up his countrymen to a madness of which the Clare election was the type. The Catholics had a common grievance and a common sympathy, which, since the union, had been a constant source of irritation and of occasional alarm. But a real sense of the imminent danger of refusing concession had never been produced until the proof was supplied by the Clare election that local and personal attachments were weakened, that the friendly relations of men in different classes were loosened, and that a power had arisen “to unite the scattered elements of society into a homogeneous and disciplined mass, yielding willing obedience to the assumed authority of superior intelligence, hostile to the law and

[1828-1829 A.D.]

to the government which administered it." At the period of the Clare election the lord lieutenant wrote to the home secretary that he was quite certain that the agitators could lead on the people to rebellion at a moment's notice, but that the hope of tranquillity, present and future, rested upon the belief of O'Connell and his friends that they could carry their cause by agitation and intimidation, without coming to blows. Lord Anglesey believed their success to be inevitable. "There may be rebellion: you may put to death thousands; you may suppress it; but it will only be to put off the day of compromise, and in the mean time the country is still more impoverished, and the minds of the people are, if possible, still more alienated." On the 5th of July Mr. O'Connell was elected for Clare. A petition against his return was presented to the house of commons, but nothing was done, for the session was nearly at an end. The great agitator did not attempt to take his seat during the three weeks which elapsed between his return and the prorogation of parliament. He had six months before him for continued agitation. The session closed on the 28th of July, without a word in the king's speech regarding Ireland.

THE CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL (1829 A.D.)

The duke of Wellington, in the course of a debate in May, 1829, said "It is now well known that during the whole of the last autumn and summer I had those measures in contemplation which have been since brought into effect. It is also well known that my principal object, and that to which all my efforts were directed, was to prevail upon the person in these kingdoms the most interested of all others, from his situation, in the settlement of the Catholic question, to give his consent to its being brought forward." In the autumn and summer of 1828 the duke had not only a difficulty with the king, but with the one of most importance amongst his colleagues. At the beginning of August the premier and the lord chancellor had been in communication with the king. Mr. Peel was invited to participate in the proposed arrangement. He gave his deliberate opinion by letter to the duke of Wellington, that there was upon the whole less of evil in making a decided effort to settle the Catholic question than in leaving it, as it had been left, an open question. Mr. Peel, however, proposed to retire from the government, although he was willing to support it, but unwilling to undertake the management of this business in the house of commons. Twenty years after, he says that this letter was written with a clear foresight of the penalties to which the course he resolved to take would expose him—"the rage of party, the alienation of private friends, the interruption of family affections." He would not condescend to notice other penalties, such as the loss of office and of royal favour, "if they were not the heaviest in the estimation of vulgar and low-minded men incapable of appreciating higher motives of public conduct."

The efforts of the duke of Wellington to obtain the sanction of the king that the whole subject of Ireland, including the Catholic question, should be taken into consideration by his confidential servants, were not successful during the remaining months of 1828. In his interviews with the duke his majesty manifested much uneasiness and irritation. Lord Eldon represents that the king told him, at an interview on the 28th of March, 1829, that his ministers had threatened to resign if the measures were not proceeded in, and that he had said to them, "Go on," when an interview which had lasted several hours had brought him into such a state that he hardly knew what he was

[1829 A.D.]

about. Mr. Peel, very early in the course of these discussions, had expressed his opinion that whenever it was once determined that an attempt should be made by the government to settle the Catholic question, the settlement should be, if possible, a complete one. Partial concessions would be of no use. On the 12th of January, 1829, the six ministers who had voted uniformly against the Catholic claims had each a separate interview with his majesty, when he intimated his consent that the whole question of Ireland should be considered without his being pledged by such consent to adopt the views of his confidential servants, however unanimous they might be. On the 17th the duke of Wellington wrote to Mr. Peel, that he did not see the slightest chance, in consequence of what had passed in interviews with the king, and with certain of the bishops, of getting rid of these difficulties, if Mr. Peel should not continue in office. Mr. Peel yielded to his earnest solicitation. When the draft of the speech from the throne was submitted to the king, he gave a reluctant assent to the passage which implied an intention on the part of the government to make a decisive effort to adjust the Catholic question. The parliament was opened by commission on the 5th of February. The day before the meeting of parliament Mr. Peel addressed a letter to the vice-chancellor of Oxford expressing his intention to vacate his seat for that university.

In the speech from the throne the existence of an association in Ireland dangerous to the public peace, and inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution, was pointed out, to ask for such powers as might enable his majesty to maintain his just authority. "His majesty recommends that, when this essential object shall have been accomplished, you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland; and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in church and state, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge." In the house of peers the duke of Wellington announced that the measure which it was the intention of the government to propose for the adoption of parliament, would extend to the removal generally of all civil disabilities under which the Roman Catholics laboured, with exceptions solely resting on special grounds. In the house of commons Mr. Peel made a similar announcement. The great contest in parliament was not to come on till Mr. Peel should be in his place to take his proper share in the discussions. He was persuaded to allow his name to be put in nomination for re-election at Oxford. His friends did not sufficiently estimate the power of a party cry. Sir Robert Inglis, his opponent, was finally returned by a majority of one hundred and forty-six votes. Lord Colchester records the termination of the election, adding, "Cheers for Lord Eldon in convocation, hisses for the king, hisses and groans for Peel." Nevertheless the value of these hisses and groans may be tested from the fact that Mr. Peel polled twice as many first-class men as Sir Robert Inglis, and the "No popery" and "Church in danger" cries were not universally successful, for he had three hundred and thirty-three clergymen amongst his supporters. Mr. Peel took his seat for Westbury on the 3rd of March. The bill for suppressing the Catholic Association had passed during the secretary's absence from parliament. In that interval several thousand petitions were presented to parliament—the greater part against the proposed measures of concession. Lord Eldon was the most indefatigable in

[1829 A.D.]

the enforcement of the prayer of these very exclusive productions, which echoed his own assertion on the first night of the session, that if a Roman Catholic were ever admitted to form part of the legislature, or to hold any of the great offices of state, from that moment the sun of Great Britain was set forever. In the house of commons Mr. Peel gave notice, on the 3rd of March, that on the 5th he would call attention to that part of the speech from the throne which referred to the civil disabilities of the Roman Catholics. On the evening of the 3rd the king commanded the duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, and Mr. Peel to attend him at Windsor on the following day. The audience lasted five hours. The king most tenaciously insisted that no alteration should be made of the ancient oath of supremacy. The ministers as firmly maintained that without this alteration the measure of relief would be unavailing. They left the royal closet in the assured belief that their official functions were at an end. "At the close of the interview [says Peel "'] the king took leave of us with great composure and great kindness, gave to each of us a salute on each cheek, and accepted our resignation of office, frequently expressing his sincere regret at the necessity which compelled us to retire from his service." Before the king went to rest a great and sudden change had come over him. He wrote to the duke of Wellington to acquaint him that he anticipated so much difficulty in the attempt to form another administration that he could not dispense with the services of those whose resignations he had accepted, and that they were at liberty to proceed with the measures of which notice had been given in parliament.

On the 5th of March, from ten o'clock in the morning, all the avenues of the house of commons were crowded by persons who hoped to gain admission to the gallery. The doors were not opened till six o'clock; for, according to a notice previously given, the house was called over. To put an end to all possible cavil on the part of the king, Mr. Peel had suggested to the duke of Wellington that a distinct authority should be given to them to say to parliament that the measures in contemplation were proposed with the entire sanction of his majesty. That authority having been received during the night, Mr. Peel commenced his speech in these words: "I rise as a minister of the king, and sustained by the just authority which belongs to that character, to vindicate the advice given to his majesty by an united cabinet." With regard to himself, he had for years attempted to maintain the exclusion of Roman Catholics from parliament and the high offices of state. He did not think it was an unnatural or unreasonable struggle. He resigned it, in consequence of the conviction that it could no longer be advantageously maintained. As Mr. Peel proceeded to explain the proposed measure, in a speech of four hours, the cheers of the house were occasionally heard in Westminster Hall. The bill would admit a Roman Catholic to parliament upon taking an oath, in place of the old oath of supremacy, that he would support the existing institutions of the state, and not injure those of the church. It would admit a Roman Catholic to all the greatest offices of government, with the exception of regent, lord chancellor of England, and lord chancellor and viceroy of Ireland. All corporate offices and municipal privileges, all that pertained to the administration of justice, would be open to Roman Catholics. From all offices connected with the church, with its universities and schools, and from church patronage, they would be necessarily excluded. Commands in the army and navy had been open to them before this measure. Connected with the Bill of Relief, there were securities and restrictions proposed; and by a separate bill the qualification for the freeholder's electoral franchise in Ireland was increased from forty shillings to ten pounds.

It is unnecessary to trace the course of the debates in either House during the conflict, which lasted to the 10th of April, when the Relief Bill was read a third time in the house of lords by a majority of a hundred and four. It had been passed in the house of commons, on the 30th of March, by a majority of a hundred and seventy-eight. Amidst the passionate invectives, the taunts and sneers, of the opposers of the measure, there was one sentence in the speech of a great man who relied upon no oratorical power for enforcing conviction, which made more impression upon the mind and heart of the nation than the highest displays of argument or declamation. Thus spoke the duke of Wellington, on moving the second reading of the bill on the 4th of April: "My lords, I am one of those who have probably passed a longer period of my life engaged in war than most men, and principally, I may say, in civil war; and I must say this,—that if I could avoid, by any sacrifice whatever, even one month of civil war in the country to which I am attached, I would sacrifice my life in order to do it. I say that there is nothing which destroys property and prosperity, and demoralises character, to the degree that civil war does; by it the hand of man is raised against his neighbour, against his brother, and against his father; the servant betrays his master, and the whole scene ends in confusion and devastation. Yet, my lords, this is the resource to which we must have looked—these are the means to which we must have applied, in order to have put an end to this state of things, if we had not made the option of bringing forward the measures, for which I hold myself responsible." The great captain was assailed as virulently as Mr. Peel was assailed, by the most furious of those who assumed to be the only true supporters of church and state.

The earl of Winchelsea published a letter in which he insinuated that the duke had supported the establishment of King's College, that he "might the more effectually, under the cloak of some outward show of zeal for the Protestant religion, carry on his insidious designs for the infringement of our liberties, and the introduction of popery into every department of the state." The duke demanded that the letter should be withdrawn; the earl refused to do so. On the 21st of March the two peers had a hostile meeting in Battersea Fields. The duke of Wellington fired without effect; the earl of Winchelsea discharged his pistol in the air, and then tendered a written apology. In a letter to the duke of Buckingham a month after this transaction the duke of Wellington thus defended a conduct which he admitted must have "shocked many good men": "The truth is that the duel with Lord Winchelsea was as much part of the Roman Catholic question, and it was as necessary to undertake it and carry it out to the extremity to which I did carry it, as it was to do everything else which I did to attain the object which I had in view. I was living here in an atmosphere of calumny. I could do nothing that was not misrepresented as having some bad purpose in view." When Lord Winchelsea published his letter the duke determined to act upon it. "The atmosphere of calumny in which I had been some time living cleared away. The system of calumny was discontinued." Mr. Peel had to endure calumnies even more galling than those which the duke of Wellington decided to resist by the course which a brave soldier, jealous upon the point of honour, was then almost compelled to take in deference to the false opinions of society. Twenty years after this great political struggle Sir Robert Peel wrote the following solemn appeal to protect his memory: "I can with truth affirm, as I do solemnly affirm in the presence of Almighty God, 'to whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid,' that in advising and promoting the measures of 1829 I was swayed by no fear except the fear of public

[1829 A.D.]

calamity, and that I acted throughout on a deep conviction that those measures were not only conducive to the general welfare, but that they had become imperatively necessary in order to avert from interests which had a special claim upon my support—the interests of the church and of institutions connected with the church—an imminent and increasing danger.”

The Catholic Relief Bill received the royal assent on the 13th of April. Lord Eldon at two previous audiences of George IV had urged him to refuse the royal assent. The king, who was a great actor, not only in the power of mimicry which he possessed, but in exhibiting a well-feigned passion, deceived his ex-chancellor into the belief that his old master would peril everything, even his throne, by this obsolete exercise of the royal prerogative. Dangerous, almost infatuated, as was this advice of Lord Eldon, we cannot doubt his sincerity; we cannot believe that any corrupt motive, or even any personal ambition, prompted his interference to avert what he believed would be a great political evil. He distrusted the Roman Catholics, not from a blind adherence to a worn-out bigotry, but from a reliance upon that unstatesmanlike caution which could not look beyond a dark present into a brighter future. Happily, he had to deal with a sovereign of different character than he who compelled Pitt—in the fear that he might drive the king into insanity—to lay aside the implied pledges of the union, and thus to make the legislature equivocate for thirty years with the just expectations of disappointed millions. A few childish lamentations, and there would be an end of the opposition of George IV to the resolve of his ministry. He would go to Hanover—he would return no more to England—let them get a Catholic king in Clarence—were his ejaculations at the interview of the 9th of April. On the 14th Lord Eldon wrote to his daughter: “The fatal bill received the royal assent yesterday afternoon. After all I had heard in my visits not a day’s delay.”

O’CONNELL’S SECOND RETURN FOR CLARE (1829 A.D.)

About a month after the passing of the bill Mr. O’Connell was introduced to the house of commons for the purpose of taking his seat for Clare. A petition against his return had been referred to a committee, who declared that he was duly returned. Mr. O’Connell had been elected before the passing of the new act, and the clerk of the house accordingly tendered to him the oath of supremacy which was required to be taken under the old law. This oath Mr. O’Connell refused to take, claiming to take the oath set forth in the Relief Act. He was the next day heard at the bar. His courtesy, his moderation, his legal knowledge, surprised the house, and called forth the approving voices of the great law officers who had opposed his claim at once to take his seat. Upon a division a new writ was ordered for Clare. A large subscription was entered into for securing Mr. O’Connell’s second return, which took place on the 30th of July. His violence at that election was a painful and disgusting contrast to his assumed gentleness at the bar of the house of commons. His unmeasured words almost induced a general apprehension that the great measure of Catholic emancipation had been too readily yielded to that sense of an overwhelming necessity which had converted opposing statesmen into its responsible promoters.

The parliament was prorogued on the 24th of June. The landowners when they returned to their country mansions did not find happy faces amidst either tenants or labourers. The summer and autumn were wet and cold; the harvest was protracted; the crops were ill got in, and were hurried

[1830 A.D.]

to market. They were found to be of inferior quality, and prices suffered temporarily a great depression. Then came the severest winter since 1813-1814. Parliament met on the 4th of February, 1830. The king's speech lamented that notwithstanding the indication of active commerce afforded by increased exports, distress should prevail amongst the agricultural and manufacturing classes. One effectual mode of mitigating the pressure upon industrial capital was announced in the intention to propose a considerable reduction in the amount of public expenditure. The promise was realised. The chancellor of the exchequer proposed, on the 15th of March, the total remission of the excise duties on beer, cider, and leather. Increased duties on spirits were to supply a portion of the deficiency. The propositions of the government were finally agreed to.

DEATH OF GEORGE IV (1830 A.D.)

On the 24th of May a message was sent to both houses of parliament by the king, announcing his illness and stating the inconvenience of signing public instruments with his own hand. A bill was introduced for the appointment of commissioners to affix the king's sign-manual by a stamp, in the king's presence, and by his immediate order given by word of mouth. The bill received the royal assent on the 29th of May. On the 26th of June, at three o'clock in the morning, King George IV expired at Windsor castle. It is difficult to look back upon the career of this prince, whose sovereignty either as regent or king formed one of the most important eras in the annals of the country, without feeling how much his life had been one of great opportunities wasted and of natural powers perverted; how the circumstances by which he had been surrounded from his youth were almost wholly injurious to his character and his happiness. Succeeding generations—in some degree by the force of contrast—have come to look very severely upon the faults of this erring brother. They were painfully visited upon him by the absence of all domestic happiness, by the feeling that he was not beloved or respected by the people he was appointed to rule over. The duke of Wellington has given a character of the monarch who held in dread the great captain's strong sense and inflexible resolution. "He was indeed," said the duke, "the most extraordinary compound of talent, wit, buffoonery, obstinacy, and good feeling—in short, a medley of the most opposite qualities, with a great preponderance of good—that I ever saw in any character in my life."^h





CHAPTER III

WILLIAM IV AND THE REFORM BILL

[1830-1837 A.D.]

The end was already approaching. King and queen sat sullenly apart in their palace. Peer and country gentleman moodily awaited the ruin of their country and the destruction of their property. Fanaticism still raved at the wickedness of a people; the people, clamouring for work, still succumbed before the mysterious disease which was continually claiming more and more victims. But the nation cared not for the sullenness of the court, the forebodings of the landed classes, the ravings of the pulpit, or even the mysterious operations of a new plague. The deep gloom which had overshadowed the land had been relieved by one single ray. The victory had been won. The bill had become law.—WALFOLE.²

Upon the death of George IV, on the 26th of June, 1830, William Henry, duke of Clarence, was forthwith proclaimed king by the title of William IV. No immediate alteration took place in the government, his majesty signifying to the duke of Wellington and the ministers of his cabinet that he was anxious to retain their services. A portion of the whigs had been for some time contemplating a coalition with the Wellington and Peel party; but their advances were not met half way, and the whigs more resolutely than before took up the cry for a reform in parliament.

On Friday, the 23d of July, his majesty went in state to the house of lords and, after a most gracious speech, prorogued parliament. The necessary dissolution was made next day by proclamation; and writs were ordered for the election of a new parliament, to be returnable on the 14th of September.

On the 8th of September the coronation of the king, by the title of William IV, was solemnised in the ancient abbey of Westminster; and even on this occasion the change of times and fashions as well as sovereigns was marked in the event. In the coronation of George IV, who was eminently a king of shows and pageants, not an iota of the old feudal observances, whether chivalrous or mediæval, had been omitted, and according as the minds of the spectators had been affected, it was the most august and splendid of exhibitions,

or the most useless and ridiculous of imitations or caricatures. On the present occasion, it was an observance suited to the more refined spirit of the times and the serious importance of the occasion. It was mainly a solemn religious service, confined to the interior of the building; and the chief procession was that of the state carriages which conveyed William and his queen Adelaide from St. James' palace to the abbey. William was dressed in his naval uniform, the sight of which warmed the hearts of his subjects as the appropriate token of our naval supremacy, and the joyful cry that rang from street to street, as he moved along, was, "God bless our sailor-king!"

It was under circumstances of gloom and anxiety that the new parliament assembled on the 26th of October. The king opened the session in person. In his speech he alluded to the events which had occurred on the Continent; to the continuance of his diplomatic relations with the new French dynasty; to the endeavours which, in concert with his allies, he was making to restore tranquillity to the Netherlands; and to the expediency of maintaining those general treaties by which the political system of Europe had been established. The usual addresses were carried in both houses, though not without very evident signs of a vigorous opposition to ministers. The rallying cry was "parliamentary reform," or "parliamentary reform and retrenchment." The duke of Wellington resolutely declared that he would grant no reform—that no reform was necessary—that the constitution would be spoiled if an attempt were made to amend it. In replying to Earl Grey, he said, that he would not hesitate unequivocally to declare his opinion that we possessed a legislature which answered all good purposes, better than any which had been ever tried; and that if he had to frame a legislature for another country, his aim would be to form one which would produce similar results: under such circumstances, he was not only unprepared to bring forward any measure of reform, but ready at once to declare that, so long as he held a station in the government, he should feel it his duty to resist any such measures when proposed by others. In the commons, Mr. Brougham brought forward the question of reform even before the address was moved. He reprobated the report that he was desirous of introducing a radical, sweeping innovation. This report was utterly devoid of truth. He for one was resolved to take his stand on the ancient ways of the constitution.

The king and queen had promised to honour the lord mayor's feast at Guildhall with their presence. The citizens had made magnificent preparations for their reception. Late on the evening of the 7th of November the lord mayor received a note from the home secretary (Mr. Peel), stating that his majesty had resolved, by the advice of his ministers, to postpone his visit to the city to a future opportunity, because, from information recently received, "there was reason to apprehend that, notwithstanding the devoted loyalty and affection borne to his majesty by the citizens of London, advantage would be taken of an occasion which must necessarily assemble a vast number of persons by night to produce tumult and confusion, and thereby to endanger the properties and lives of his majesty's subjects; and it would be a source of deep and lasting concern to their majesties were any calamity to occur on the occasion of their visit to the city of London." This announcement filled the metropolis with doubt and alarm. Men believed that some atrocious conspiracy against the royal person had been discovered, or that the poorer classes had organised a revolution. The funds fell, and in the provinces it was pretty generally expected that the next mail would bring intelligence that London was in a state of insurrection. By the advice of ministers the purposed visit of the king was abandoned.

[1830 A.D.]

The most was made of the event by the opposition in parliament. It was laid to the account of ministers that his majesty could not meet his faithful commons of London without fear and riot. It was urged that the exceeding unpopularity of the duke of Wellington had been the cause of so shameful an occurrence; and that that excessive unpopularity had been caused by the fatal declaration of the duke against every species of reform. It was asked whether the duke did not now feel that he had quitted his own proper sphere of greatness; whether a ministry so unpopular could hope to stand.

On the 15th of November Sir Henry Parnell moved for a select committee to make a thorough revision of the civil list. The debate was a short one. On the division there appeared a majority of twenty-nine against ministers, the numbers being 233 to 204. Next day the duke of Wellington in the lords, and Sir Robert Peel in the commons, announced that, in consequence of the vote of the preceding evening, they had tendered, and his majesty had accepted, their resignations, and that they continued to hold their offices only until successors should be appointed. They afterwards declared that they had come to this resolution, not so much on account of the civil-list vote, as from an anticipation of the result of a division on Mr. Brougham's proposition for reform, which stood for the very day on which the announcement was made.

EARL GREY FORMS A MINISTRY (1830 A.D.)

The tories and anti-emancipationists had lent their votes to displace the duke of Wellington, but by themselves they were not strong enough to entertain any hope of setting up a cabinet of their own. The Canning party were far asunder from them, some of them being all for the duke, and some for reform. The king had no choice. He could only take the whigs. Accordingly he authorised Earl Grey to form a new administration. The earl accepted the office, on condition that he should have his majesty's authority to make parliamentary reform a cabinet measure. In the course of a week the new government was put together: it contained a considerable admixture of those who had been adherents of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson. Earl Grey was first lord of the treasury; Mr. Brougham, lord chancellor; Lord Althorpe, chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Melbourne, home secretary; Lord Palmerston, foreign secretary; Lord Goderich, colonial secretary; Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty; Marquis of Lansdowne, president of the council; Lord Durham, lord privy-seal; Lord Hill, commander-in-chief; Lord Auckland, president of the board of trade; Mr. C. Grant, president of the board of control; Lord Holland, duchy of Lancaster; the duke of Devonshire, lord chamberlain; the duke of Richmond, postmaster-general; Lord John Russell, paymaster of the forces; the Right Hon. C. W. Wynne, secretary-at-war, etc. Mr. Denman became attorney-general; Sir William Horne, solicitor-general. The marquis of Anglesey was again appointed lord-lieutenant for Ireland. There was a suspension of business in parliament till the new members should be re-elected. Mr. Stanley, the new chief secretary for Ireland, encountered a mortifying defeat at Preston, where the right of suffrage was almost universal. He was opposed by orator Hunt; and by that demagogue, aided by radical reform, the heir of the house of Derby, a member of the new whig ministry, and the representative of temperate and moderate reform, was completely beaten.

During the remainder of the year no business of importance was transacted, except the passing of a regency bill. This bill provided that, in the event of a posthumous child of the present queen, her majesty should be guardian and

[1830-1831 A.D.]

regent during the minority. If no such event should occur, the duchess of Kent was to be guardian and regent during the minority of her daughter, the princess Victoria, the heiress presumptive. The princess Victoria was not to marry, while a minor, without the consent of the king, or, if he died, without the consent of both houses of parliament; and the regency of the duchess of Kent was to be at an end if, while regent, she married a foreigner.

On the 23rd of December parliament adjourned to the 3rd of February, ministers having declared that a long adjournment was necessary, in order that they might have time to prepare the different measures which they intended to submit, and more especially to concoct that plan of reform to which they had pledged themselves on accepting office, and by which alone they could hope to retain it.

In the course of this eventful year there came into operation in England a change far more important than all the political mutations on the Continent put together. The first great railway with locomotive engines—that between Liverpool and Manchester—was finished and opened; and the triumphant success of the experiment led directly to the construction of far more extensive lines. Unhappily the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was clouded by the lamentable death of Mr. Huskisson, one of the members for Liverpool, who had accompanied the duke of Wellington to the celebration.

Before the close of 1830 the demand for parliamentary reform had assumed a new character and aspect. It was no longer the mere war-cry of a political party, that could be silenced by contradictions or trivial concessions. It was no longer limited to the disfranchisement of a few close or corrupt boroughs, and the transference of the forfeited suffrage to certain towns and communities that were still unrepresented. Neither could it be postponed, as had hitherto been the case, to a convenient season, when circumstances would be more favourable for change, and the public mind in a more tranquil state for its accomplishment. It was to be upon a scale so ample, that instead of being a political step in advance, which the contention of parties might favour or retard, it was to be a national revolution; and not only was it to be granted by wholesale, instead of instalments, but granted immediately—upon the instant. Never indeed was the “omnipotence” of parliament so devoutly believed in as now for the cure of every national evil, and in proportion to the extravagance of such a hope, was the loudness and universality of the outcry.

PLANS FOR PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

On the 3rd of February, the appointed day, parliament reassembled, and Earl Grey in the lords, and Viscount Althorpe in the commons, announced that a plan of parliamentary reform had been agreed to by ministers, and would be introduced at as early a period as possible. It was not, however, until the 1st of March that the plan was introduced in the commons by Lord John Russell. The plan, we believe, had been altered and realtered during the interval. Lord John Russell now declared that ministers discarded the notion of complying with violent and extravagant demands. Their wish was to frame a measure which would give satisfaction to every reasonable man in the country: they wished to take their stand between two hostile parties, neither agreeing with the bigots on the one hand that no reform was necessary, nor agreeing with the fanatics on the other that only one particular reform could be wholesome and satisfactory.

The leading principles of the ministerial plan consisted, first, of disfranchisement of small places which had hitherto sent members to parliament,

[1831 A.D.]

and of enfranchisement of large towns and cities which had hitherto been unrepresented: of an extension of the franchise, in order to increase the number of electors in those places which were allowed to retain, in whole or in part, their existing privileges. All voters were to be duly registered—an excellent regulation. In order to diminish the expenses of elections, as well as opportunities for bribery, drunkenness, and corruption of all kinds, the duration of the poll was to be diminished, and that for counties to be taken simultaneously at different places. The good which has proceeded from this regulation is indisputable and great. Lord John Russell said that the general result of the measure would be to create a new constituency of about 500,000; for the increase in counties would be about 100,000, that in towns already represented about 110,000, that in the new boroughs 50,000, that in London 95,000, that in Scotland 60,000, and that in Ireland about 40,000. His lordship declared himself against short parliaments and vote by ballot, and concluded by requesting leave to bring in his bill.

This motion brought on a debate which lasted seven nights, and which called up more than seventy orators. The opponents of it said that the whole essence of the scheme was not reform but revolution; that the measure proposed nothing less than to remove from the house of commons every alloy of monarchical or aristocratical principle, and convert it into a pure and resistless democracy, which it never had been, and which, consistently with the British constitution, it never ought to be. This new constitution rested on some supposed necessity for increasing the power of the people; but the power of the people was already strong enough: the true danger to be dreaded in this mixed government arose from the influence of the people, and not from the influence of the crown or of the aristocracy. Was it intended to convert these kingdoms into an unrestricted democracy? Were ministers prepared to say that a mob could govern a mob? There was a variety of interests connected with the country which required to be represented in parliament, and were now represented by means of the boroughs (called rotten) that were to be disfranchised by this bill. If they were so disfranchised, the representation of those interests would be annihilated. Mr. Horace Twiss said he had no objection to any increase of the representation of great trading interests; but he could not see the policy of calling in the wisdom of householders paying £10 of rent. The measure would let in no great interests: it would promote the influence of shopkeepers and country attorneys. The leader of the country club would now be the important man in his district, and these interests, however respectable in their way, were not the interests which required additional representation. They were interests which would be represented under the proposed change, by those shallow but dogged politicians with whom relief from taxation was everything, and public credit and national faith nothing—by whom rent and tithe were regarded as vile incumbrances. And when half the constitution had thus been surrendered, would the violent reformers be satisfied? They themselves had avowed that they would not; and that, having obtained so much, they would, at a convenient time, demand more. It was not this parliamentary reform that could reduce the present expenditure or pay off the debts of the past. Numerous references were made to the French Revolution and to the imitations of it in other parts of Europe. The promoters of the bill more than hinted that the reformers would try a revolution in England, if they were not pacified by this measure; the opposers of the bill denied that there was any such fear—denied that the measure would satisfy the radicals. There was a better security than the moderation or timidity of the radicals for the preservation of order. The widely spread

[1831 A.D.]

industry of the country, the stored-up savings even of the lower orders, the dividends of the public stocks, were solid grounds for confidence in the security of the institutions of the country. The very burdens of the country formed some sort of security for its tranquillity and welfare. The superincumbent weight of the national debt, while it pressed, gave stability. There would be no revolution to fear nor any permanent dissatisfaction to dread. But if we decided on this great question, not according to experience and wisdom, but according to the cry of the day, then we should let in danger, then we should let in revolution, by teaching the people that their impatient will alone could control the course of the legislature. The opponents of the bill, however, permitted this long contest to terminate without a division: and Lord John Russell's bill was brought in, and ordered to be read a first time. Ministers afterwards admitted that if a division had now taken place, they would, according to their calculation, have been left in a minority. But the opposition did not form a combined body; it had no regular plan of operations, and it was guided by no great leader.

On the 21st of March the second reading of the bill was moved in the commons. The debate lasted two days. It was opened by Sir R. Vyvyan, who moved, as an amendment, that the bill should be read a second time that day six months. At the division there were, including the speaker and the four tellers, 603 members present, the largest number that had ever divided on any question in that house. Of these 302 were for the original motion, and 301 for the amendment; the second reading being thus carried by a majority of one.

On the 18th of April Lord John Russell moved the order of the day for a committee of the whole house, when General Gascoyne immediately endeavoured to get rid of the bill by a motion for counteracting one of its essential clauses, respecting the proposed diminution of the number of representatives for England and Wales. This motion led to a violent debate, ending in a division on the following night, which left ministers in a minority of eight.

Two days after this division, or on the 21st of April, Lord Wharncliffe in the upper house asked Earl Grey whether ministers had advised his majesty to dissolve this parliament, which had not yet existed quite six months. He put the question, he said, because, if he received a certain answer, it was his intention to adopt some measure in relation to that subject. Earl Grey replied that he declined answering the question. Lord Wharncliffe then gave notice that he would next day move an address to the king, praying that his majesty would be graciously pleased not to exercise his own undoubted prerogative of dissolving parliament. On the same day Sir R. Vyvyan asked ministers in the commons whether they intended to proceed with the reform bill, or to advise his majesty to dissolve parliament, because the house of commons would not consent to reduce the number of English members. The chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Althorp, replied, that he had no hesitation in answering one of the questions, or in saying that ministers, having considered the necessary consequence of the division of the House on the bill the other evening, it was not their intention to proceed further with the bill. It would not be consistent with his duty to answer the second question. On the 22nd, which was the very day after the question was put by Lord Wharncliffe and Sir R. Vyvyan, there was a great ferment in both houses, for the rumour had been spread in the course of the day that king and ministers had made up their mind for dissolution. In the lords the ferment became a storm, a tempest. The order of the day was Lord Wharncliffe's motion for an address to his majesty against the dissolution. His lordship had uttered

[1831 A.D.]

only a few words, when the duke of Richmond, postmaster-general in this recently seated ministry, rose to complain that all the peers were not sitting in their proper places, as was usual on such occasions. Some expressions of dissent being uttered, his grace of Richmond insisted that the standing order should be enforced—that their lordships should keep their places, and that persons present who were not members of that house should be ordered to withdraw. Noise and confusion ensued, and the marquis of Londonderry was heard to say that ministers were taking the crown off the king's head. The duke of Richmond would then move another standing order—that against the use of improper language. The marquis of Londonderry denied that any offensive language had been used, "though the noble duke seemed to think himself the hero of this *coup d'état*, and to be able to smother the expression of their lordships' sentiments on this most extraordinary occasion."

Lord Wharncliffe being allowed to proceed, hurriedly moved: "That an humble address be presented to his majesty, humbly to represent that we, his majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the lords spiritual and temporal, etc., think ourselves bound in duty humbly to represent to his majesty that alarming reports of an intended dissolution of parliament have gone forth; that, dutifully acknowledging the wisdom of the constitution in trusting to the crown that just and legal prerogative, and fully confiding in his majesty's royal wisdom and paternal care of his people for the most beneficial exercise of it, we desire with great humility to represent to his majesty that it appears to us that a prorogation or dissolution of parliament at the present juncture, and under the present excitement of the public mind both in Great Britain and Ireland, is likely to be attended with great danger to his majesty's crown and dignity, and to every institution of the state, by preventing that calm and deliberate consideration of any question tending to the reform of the representation of the people which the importance of that subject so especially requires." Lord Shaftesbury being called to the woolsack, amidst great excitement and discordant noises, succeeded in restoring some degree of order. Lord Mansfield then addressed the house. Such a scene as this, he said, he had never before witnessed in that house, and he hoped never to see anything like it again. He would use no intemperate language, but he would nevertheless assert, as far as God Almighty gave him the means of understanding, that the crown and the country were now about to be placed in a most awful predicament, unparalleled at any previous period.

PARLIAMENT DISSOLVED (1831 A.D.)

Lord Mansfield was yet speaking when the king entered the house and put an end to all discussion. The house of commons having been summoned, his majesty prorogued parliament with a speech in which he said the prorogation was with a view to immediate dissolution, and that he had been induced to resort to this measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of his people, in the way in which it could be most constitutionally expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the representation as circumstances might appear to require. The speech also thanked the commons for the supplies which they had voted. Next day came forth the proclamation announcing a dissolution and directing a new election. The writs were made returnable on the 14th of June.

The dissolution was celebrated in many places by illuminations. The lord mayor authorised an illumination of the city of London. At the West End a rabble vented their fury on the houses or windows of several peers and com-

[1831 A.D.]

moners, because they had opposed the Reform Bill. Among the windows which suffered most were those of the duke of Wellington and Mr. Baring. "In political disputes, to place candles in windows is no proof of political opinion or of anything else except a prudent desire to avoid the outrages of a mob; but these illuminations were made use of by the reformers to keep up their incessant cry that the inhabitants of the country, from one end to another, were animated by one universal feeling of enthusiasm for the Reform Bill, and for the act which got rid of a parliament that would never have passed it."

THE NEW PARLIAMENT REJECTS THE REFORM BILL (1831 A.D.)

After an amount and universality of rioting, that shook the island to its extremities, the election for the new parliament was completed. It was as thoroughly pledged to reform as the most sanguine of the expectants could desire; and from the test that had been established for the candidates when they presented themselves for the suffrage, and the promises exacted from them, the chosen members were styled by their opponents a company of pledged delegates, and no true house of commons. Only six out of eighty-two county members were opposed to the bill. London returned four reforming members, and Yorkshire the same number. On the 14th of June the parliament was opened by commission, and Mr. Manners Sutton was re-elected speaker without opposition; but a whole week was occupied with swearing in the members, so that the session was not opened by his majesty in person until the 21st. The first subject in the royal speech was that of reform, to which the attention of both houses was earnestly called, and the confident hope was expressed that in their measures for its adjustment they would "carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the constitution, by which the prerogative of the crown, the authority of both houses of parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured." It expressed the confident hope that peace would be maintained by England, notwithstanding the civil commotions which had disturbed some parts of Europe and the contests that were existing in Poland. It stated that a British squadron had been sent before Lisbon with a peremptory demand of satisfaction for a series of insults and injuries; that a prompt compliance with that demand had prevented the necessity of further measures, but that his majesty had not yet been enabled to re-establish his diplomatic relations with the Portuguese government. The only dismal parts of the speech were those which referred to the spread in Europe of the cholera, to the scarcity and famine which prevailed in the western counties of Ireland, and to the system of violence and outrage which had for some time been carried on to an alarming extent in that country. As the king returned to St. James' palace he was vociferously applauded by the people as "the patriot king," "the sailor king," "the best king that had ever been."

In both houses the government was severely blamed for not acting with proper vigour in suppressing the disgraceful riotous proceedings at the late illuminations. The addresses were agreed to without any useless division. And then to the Reform Bill!

On the 24th of June Lord John Russell again brought forward that bill, admitting that there had been some slight alterations made in it, and insisting that all such alterations were improvements. Sir Robert Peel professed his unaltered sentiments in opposition to the measure. The first reading was allowed to pass, but at Sir Robert's suggestion the second reading was postponed from the 30th of June to the 4th of July. The alterations which had

[1831 A.D.]

been made in the bill went rather to enlarge than to limit the number of electors.

On the 4th of July, when the second reading was proposed, Sir John Walsh moved as an amendment that the bill should be read a second time that day six months. The debate, prolonged to very late hours, was continued during the 5th and 6th. At the end the division showed a majority of 136 in favour of ministers; the votes for the second reading being 367, and those for the amendment 231. Other efforts were made to obstruct the passage of the bill into committee, and five distinct motions for adjournment were made and defeated. In committee the bill was discussed clause by clause from the 12th of July to the 15th of September, when it was ordered to be engrossed. On the 19th of September Lord John Russell moved the third reading, and was backed by 113 against 58. After two more days of debate on the question "that the bill do pass," ministers carried their point by 345 against 236. Next day, the 22nd of September, the bill was carried up to the lords by Lord John Russell, attended by about one hundred of its staunch supporters in the lower house. The bill was then read a first time on the motion of Earl Grey, without any remark being made, and was directed to be read a second time on the 3rd of October.

When that day had arrived, after the presentation of numerous petitions in favour of the bill, Earl Grey moved the second reading. His speech on this occasion was chiefly remarkable by an appeal to the bench of bishops. He said, as they were the ministers of peace, he did most earnestly hope that the result of their votes would be such as might tend to the tranquillity and happiness of the country. And this was a species of intimidation; for, in other words, it was telling the prelates that if they voted against the Reform Bill, the tranquillity and happiness of the country would be put in peril. Lord Wharncliffe again declared that the bill would destroy the constitution by giving too great power to a most democratically constituted house of commons. A popular or rather delegated house of commons had passed this measure, and now the upper house was told that it had nothing to do but to record and register it. His lordship concluded by moving "that the bill be rejected"; but on being reminded that this mode of proceeding implied disrespect towards the lower house, Lord Wharncliffe withdrew his motion for another, "that the second reading be postponed to that day six months." The lords then adjourned. On the next day the principal speakers were, for the bill Viscount Melbourne, and against it Lord Harrowby and the duke of Wellington. The debate was again adjourned, to be renewed on the morrow. Lord Dudley and Ward, the marquis of Londonderry, lords Wynford and Eldon, argued against the whole bill with great force and with equal excitement. Lord-chancellor Brougham concluded a speech of four hours' duration, by conjuring their lordships to pass the bill, as the only means of preserving tranquillity. "As your friend," said he, "as the friend of my country, as the servant of my sovereign, I counsel you to assist us in preserving the national peace and perpetuating the national prosperity. For these reasons I pray and beseech you not to reject this bill! I call on you by all you hold most dear, by all that binds every one of us to our common country—I solemnly adjure you, yea, even on bended knees, my lords (here the chancellor bent his knee on the woollack), I implore you not to reject this bill!" Their lordships, however, at six o'clock on the following morning did reject the bill by a clear majority of forty-one.^c

Lord Eldon^d rejoices, in a letter of the next day, that the mob would not stay for the close of the debate. Their patience during a cold and drizzling

[1831 A.D.]

night of waiting in Palace Yard had been worn out; and when the peers came forth there were none to salute them with cheers or hisses. The rolling of the carriages alone was heard, as reformers or conservatives, in the broad daylight, went to their homes as quietly as if a whole nation had not been anxiously awaiting that morning to know how the great work was so far concluded.

The rejection of the Reform Bill by the house of lords was not unforeseen. The disproportion of the two parties in that house was perfectly well known. During the reigns of George III and George IV, the creation of peers had been almost exclusively confined to the tory party;—the bishops had, with very few exceptions, been selected with no forgetfulness of their political opinions. To remedy, in some degree, this disproportion, sixteen new peers had been created before the second reading of the bill. Lord Grey, in moving that reading, had addressed to the bishops a very significant warning “to put their house in order.” Many of the peers had refrained from voting; but on the 7th of October the bishops were on their bench in strong numbers; and, of thirteen present, twelve voted against the bill, nine others sending their proxies for the same object in defeating the measure which had so triumphantly passed the house of commons. The great contest was yet, however, to be fought out in another campaign. The lords had gone from the house on the Saturday morning, after such a night of excitement and fatigue as few had before encountered. On the following Monday Lord Ebrington, member for Devonshire, moved in the house of commons a resolution to the effect that the house, lamenting the present fate of the bill for amending the representation, feels itself called upon to reassert its firm adherence to the principle and leading provisions of that great measure, and to express its unabated confidence in the integrity, perseverance, and ability of those ministers who, in introducing and conducting it, had so well consulted the best interests of the country. The resolution was carried by 329 votes to 198. The public enthusiasm gave a hearty assent to the principle urged on that occasion by Mr. Macaulay, when he asked, “ought we to abandon the bill merely because the lords have rejected it? We ought to respect the lawful privileges of their house, but we ought also to assert our own.” Riot and outrage at Derby, and at Nottingham the burning of the castle by a frantic mob, clouded for a time the hope which all honest reformers entertained that reason and justice should alone prevail. The saddest, however, could relish the wit, which, however pungent, was like oil upon the waves. “Mrs. Partington” became famous throughout the land. “As for the possibility of the house of lords preventing ere long a reform of parliament,” said Sydney Smith,^c “I hold it to be the most absurd notion that ever entered into human imagination. I do not mean to be disrespectful, but the attempt of the lords to stop the progress of reform reminds me very forcibly of the great storm of Sidmouth, and of the conduct of the excellent Mrs. Partington on that occasion. In the winter of 1824 there set in a great flood upon that town—the tide rose to an incredible height—the waves rushed in upon the houses, and everything was threatened with destruction. In the midst of this sublime and terrible storm, Dame Partington, who lived upon the beach, was seen at the door of her house with mop and pattens, trundling her mop, squeezing out the sea-water, and vigorously pushing away the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic was roused. Mrs. Partington’s spirit was up; but I need not tell you that the contest was unequal. The Atlantic Ocean beat Mrs. Partington. She was excellent at a slop, or a puddle, but she should not have meddled with a tempest. Gentlemen, be at your ease—be quiet and steady. You will beat Mrs. Partington.”

[1831 A.D.]

PARLIAMENT PROROGUED; NATIONAL EXCITEMENT (1831 A.D.)

The ministry stood firm, although they were taunted with their continuance in power after they had found themselves opposed by such a majority in the house of lords as no minister had ever encountered a second time. There was no wavering in the king. He went to the house of peers on the 20th of October; and having given the royal assent to Lord Brougham's Bankruptcy Court Bill, amongst other bills, he prorogued the parliament, stating that its attention must necessarily be called upon at the opening of the ensuing session to the important question of a constitutional reform in the commons house of parliament.

It is impossible to look back at the interval between the prorogation of parliament on the 20th of October, 1831, and the conclusion of the labours of the last unreformed parliament on the 16th of August, 1832, without a sense of relief in feeling that the country had passed without permanent damage through a crisis of unexampled danger. The times were truly alarming. Nevertheless, during the great political conflict of seven months—during the terrific outbreak of a knot of miscreants at Bristol, the occasional violence of the mob in London, the partial outrages of the peasantry of the southern counties, the terrors of a new and frightful disease for which no medical authority could prescribe a satisfactory treatment and which no public regulation could arrest—the political excitement was so great and universal that, like combatants on a field of battle, the energy of the hour was sufficient to repress, whether amongst reformers or anti-reformers, any sentiment of fear that would have amounted to a panic. The nation, whether ranged on one side or the other, had never been so much in earnest since the days of the Long Parliament. It is true that the popular cause could number its supporters by thousands, whilst those on the other side might be counted by hundreds. But the leaders of the hundreds believed that they had everything to lose, and they not only fought with desperation themselves, but were cheered on by a most zealous following, who sincerely dreaded that the end of all government and the destruction of all property were close at hand. There were everywhere wrong-headed men in popular assemblies ranting about the unequal distribution of wealth; pretended teachers of political economy proclaiming the tyranny of capital, and showing how easily a change might be made by which the labourers, without any intervention, might till the fields and work the looms. Some more modestly proposed that at the death of any member of the community his widow and children should have no exclusive claim; and that all his property should be divided amongst every member of society of adult age. The absurdities that hung around every scheme for the “division of property” neutralised their possible effect upon the great body of mechanics, who were not without some means of instruction that had been placed within their reach. There was another class more open to dangerous advice, and more incapable of weighing the probable consequences of lawless acts.

The labourers in husbandry had been often told that they had a claim upon a much higher rate of allowance from the poor's-rates, whilst at this very time the enormous pressure of those rates was driving the land even of whole parishes out of cultivation. The labourers believed, as they had been long encouraged by magistrates to believe, that the parish was bound to find work and pay wherever there was no profitable work to be done. The “*Organisation du Travail*” of the French political philosophers in 1848 was not

[1831 A.D.]

an original invention. In England we had not the national workshop, but we had the parish gravel-pit. The gravel-pit lowered the wages of all agricultural labour, by confounding the distinctions between industry and idleness, between strength and weakness, between dexterity and clumsiness. All the moral qualifications that made one labourer more valuable than another were utterly broken down. And so, when the weekly pittance for unprofitable labour was doled out by the overseer of the poor—when the farmer equalised the rate of wages by reducing his ploughman and carter almost to the level of the gravel diggers, and sent their wives to the overseers to make up by allowance the just payment of which they were defrauded—the peasantry took to burning ricks and breaking machines. The machine breaking was intelligible. Machines were held to be substitutes for manual labour, and thus to diminish profitable employment. But the rick burning: How could arson be a relief for hunger? The destruction of food raised the price of food. The excessive ignorance of the peasantry—the hateful isolation of their class from their employers—the neglect of the rich—made them apt listeners to the devilish promptings of some village Cade in the beer-shop. They had undoubted grievances, and we can scarcely wonder that paupers and poachers became rick burners and machine breakers, in the belief that those above them in rank were in a conspiracy to oppress them. The southern labourers knew nothing of the Reform Bill, and cared nothing. They thought only of the misery and neglect of their own unhappy lot. “Swing” was at work months before Lord Grey came into power—“Swing” was their one reform leader. They took their own course of proclaiming their wretchedness and their ignorance, to the terror and shame of those who had kept them ignorant, and passed them by in the haughty indifference which regarded a peasant and a slave as something near akin—“slaves in ignorance,” as Arnold^f said, “without having them chained and watched to prevent them hurting us.” The jail and the gallows seemed the only remedies when property became unsafe—

“The blind mole casts
Copp’d hills toward heaven, to tell, the earth is throng’d
By man’s oppression, and the poor worm doth die for ‘t.”

In the same state of ignorance, especially of political ignorance, as the southern peasantry, but not with equal provocation for their outrages, were the dregs of the people who broke open the city jail at Derby and set the prisoners at liberty, and those who burned down Nottingham castle. More entirely distinct, even than the agricultural labourers, from those who cherished any over-zealous aspirations for an amended representation of the people, were those who formed the mass of rioters at Bristol. There, an insignificant mob of the merest outcasts of a seaport long remarkable for a filthy, ignorant, and drunken horde of labourers of the lowest class—many of the so-called workers habitual thieves—held during a Saturday afternoon, and the whole Sunday till daybreak on Monday, the lives and property of the inhabitants of one of the great cities of the empire at the mercy of their reckless brutality.

The Bristol Riots (1831 A.D.)

Sir Charles Wetherell had been amongst the most determined opponents of the Reform Bill during its passage through the house of commons. He was recorder of Bristol, and being a man of as much eccentricity as talent, he

[1831 A.D.]

disregarded the warnings which were given him, that it might be more prudent to open the city sessions on the 29th of October without any public entry. Recorders nowadays go more modestly about their business; but Sir Charles Wetherell determined to have a procession. A large number of influential inhabitants, whether as political supporters or to maintain the dignity of his judicial function, formed a great cavalcade around the sheriff's carriage in which the recorder was to enter the city. He reached the Guildhall amidst the hisses of the populace, but with no injury from the few stones that were thrown at his carriage. There was some confusion in the hall during the opening of the commission; but the preliminary business having been gone through, and the court adjourned till Monday morning, the recorder retired, the people giving three cheers for the king. Sir Charles Wetherell took up his residence at the Mansion house. This, during the whole of the afternoon, was surrounded by a mob, upon which constables occasionally rushed to seize some prominent offender, boy or man, who manifested his spirit by hurling some missile at an irritated guardian of the peace. The evening came on; the mob of blackguards became more daring; colliers came in from the neighbouring pits to join the fun, and the Mansion house was attacked in a far more formidable manner than at the earlier hour in the afternoon; for the greater number of constables had left the rioters to their diversion, and had quietly gone away to seek refreshment. In the darkness of that autumnal night the windows of the chief magistrate's residence were shattered, the doors were forced, and preparations were made to set the Mansion house on fire. Sir Charles Wetherell during the tumult effected his retreat. The troops arrived, and arrested the conflagration. The soldiers were cheered as they trotted their horses backward and forward; the commander of the district, Colonel Brereton, exhorted the mob to peace, but he did not effectually clear the streets. The ragged populace were triumphant for that Saturday.

On the Sunday morning the consequences of a too humane lenity were signally exhibited. The troops had remained in the streets all night. On the Sunday morning, all being quiet, they retired to their quarters. The churches and chapels were filled as usual, without any apprehension of danger. A crowd was again collected before the Mansion house. They burst into the hall, and reaching the upper rooms threw the furniture into the street. They penetrated to the wine cellars, and carrying off the corporation stores of the choicest port, were soon lying upon pavements dead with drunkenness. The troops again came out, and the tumult now became a wide-wasting career of rapine and destruction. There was a little firing of the 14th light dragoons upon the mob, who assaulted them with brickbats. Still there was a belief that the worst had passed. The soldiers were then, for the most part, withdrawn from the city. The subsequent proceedings of the mob sufficiently indicated the class of persons of which it was composed. They beat in the doors of the bridewell with sledge-hammers, set free the prisoners, and fired the building. Another party conducted the same operations with equal success at the new borough jail. A third manifested their zeal for liberty by releasing all confined in the Gloucester county jail. There were to be no more prisons in Bristol. From these three places of confinement the flames were rising at one and the same time. Fire now became the great manifestation of the savagery which some dreaded, or pretended to dread, as the natural result of the reform agitation. The Mansion house was set on fire. The demoniacs ran from room to room, kindling the flames, and when the roof fell in, the progress of the conflagration had been so rapid that many were cut off from a retreat. The bishop's palace was reduced to ashes. The

custom-house followed. This building was near the Mansion house in Queen's square. Prisons and stately buildings were not the sole objects of this most causeless outbreak. There was no rallying-cry in the streets, such as that of "No popery" in 1780, and of "Church and king" in 1791. No voice was heard to exclaim "The bill." It was all mad fury without any possible object except plunder and the indulgence of the grossest sensuality. At three o'clock in the morning there were forty-two dwelling-houses and warehouses burning. Two sides of Queen's square, with the exception of two houses, were destroyed. The flames were lighting the ruffians who paraded the streets and, knocking at the doors of ale houses and liquor shops, were demanding "drink or blood." Their intoxication quelled the outrages even more effectually than the soldiery, who were now brought back into the city, and hesitated not to fire and charge, as they might have done far more advantageously had force been employed at the commencement of the outbreak. The outrages were at an end; not through this final act of tardy vigour by direction of the magistracy, but through the exhaustion of the handful of blackguards when the daylight showed the extent of the ruin which they had perpetrated.

THE REFORM BILL PASSED (1832 A.D.)

Parliament assembled on the 6th of December. In the king's speech, first of all was recommended a careful consideration of the measures to be proposed for the reform of parliament; a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the question becoming daily of more pressing importance to the security of the state and to the contentment and welfare of his majesty's people. On the 12th of December Lord John Russell introduced the new bill for parliamentary reform. It was in many respects really a new measure. The results of the census of April had been obtained. The census of 1821 had been found a fallacious guide as to what boroughs ought or ought not to be disfranchised. Taking the census of 1831 as the basis of the population test, the boundaries of towns, which had been carefully surveyed, were included in the boroughs of which they had previously formed no part. A mixed test of the importance of boroughs was to be determined by the number of persons, the number of houses, and the amount of assessed taxes paid. The disfranchised boroughs were still to be fifty-six, though the list of those to be placed in what was called Schedule A was materially varied from that formerly proposed. Schedule B, of boroughs to return only one member was now reduced from forty-one to thirty, whilst others which had formerly been in this schedule were to be taken out, and to return two members. These variations from the former scheme were rendered necessary chiefly by the determination of the government not to diminish the number of the house of commons, continuing the number as it then stood of 658. Some of the most ardent reformers thought that the bill was impaired by these alterations. Sir Robert Peel taunted the ministers with having adopted amendments offered from his side of the house, but nevertheless expressed his determination of giving to the principle of this bill a steady and firm opposition. On the second reading in the house of commons there was a debate of two nights, terminating on the morning of Sunday the 18th, when the ministerial majority was 162. Parliament was now adjourned to the 17th of January.

To follow the progress of the Reform Bill through the house of commons during the next two months would be impossible for us to attempt, even if the details of the conflict were less wearisome than they now would be when the interest of such a session of skirmishes is wholly lost in the result of the

[1832 A.D.]

great battle. The Scotch and Irish bills were brought in on the 19th of January. On the 20th the house went into committee on the English bill, which committee was not ended till the 10th of March, the report being considered on the 14th. On the 19th the third reading of the bill was moved. There was again a final debate, in which the combatants on each side were marshalled in as great numbers as on any previous occasion. In a house of 594 members the bill was passed by a majority of 116.

On Monday the 26th of March the Reform Bill was carried up to the house of lords, and was read a first time on that day. There was a general opinion that the bill would not pass unscathed through the upper house without a large creation of peers. On the 7th of January Sydney Smith wrote to the countess Grey that everybody expected a creation as a matter of course. "I am for forty, to make things safe in committee." It was impossible that Lord Grey should not have felt the most extreme reluctance to resort to so bold and hazardous a measure. Somewhat later Sydney Smith wrote: "If you wish to be happy three months hence, create peers. If you wish to avoid an old age of sorrow and reproach, create peers." Upon this letter of Sydney Smith, which was addressed to Lady Grey, the following note is written by herself: "Many of Lord Grey's friends, as represented by Mr. S. Smith, concurred in the opinions expressed in this letter, and the whole of the liberal press, the *Times* in particular, urged the necessity of creating peers." The debate was carried on for four nights, Lord Ellenborough having moved as an amendment that the bill be read that day six months. At seven o'clock in the morning of the 14th of April the bill was read a second time by a majority of 9—184 contents; 175 non-contents. There were votes for the bill from some who had been absent from the division in 1831; some who had voted against it now abstained from voting; 17 who had voted against the previous bill now voted for this bill. Jeffrey, who was present through the debate, described it as not very brilliant, but in its latter stage excessively interesting. Lyndhurst's, he said, was by far the cleverest and most dangerous speech against the government; Lord Grey's reply, considering his age and the time, really astonishing—he having spoken near an hour and a half after five o'clock, from the kindling dawn into full sunlight. Of the aspect of the house through that night the lord advocate has left a striking picture. The benches of the peers very full; their demeanour, on the whole, still and solemn; nearly three hundred members of the commons clustered in the space around the throne or standing in a row of three deep below the bar; the candles renewed before the blue beams of the day came across their red light, and blazing on after the sun came in at the high windows, producing a strange effect on the red draperies and dusky tapestries on the walls.

Parliament was adjourned for the Easter recess till the 7th of May. Although there might be some rejoicing at the majority for the second reading of the bill, the popular conviction was, that it was not safe from mutilations which would have materially changed its character. For three weeks there was incessant agitation, far more formidable than riot and window-breaking. Petitions from almost every populous place exhorted "King William, the father of his country," not to hesitate if a necessity should arise for creating peers. The petition from Birmingham to the lords implored them to pass the Reform Bill into a law unimpaired in any of its great parts and provisions. On the day appointed for the parliament to meet, the political unions of Warwick, Worcester, and Stafford were assembled in Birmingham, at New Hall hill. It was considered to be the largest meeting ever held in Great Britain. There was a solemnity in the enthusiasm of this vast body of

people which may awake the memory of the fervid zeal of the old Puritans. One of the speakers, Mr. Salt, called upon the vast multitude to repeat, with head uncovered, and in face of heaven, the words which he should repeat—and every man bared his head, and slowly uttered word by word this comprehensive resolve—"With unbroken faith through every peril and privation we here devote ourselves and our children to our country's cause." On that afternoon the house of lords went into committee on the Reform Bill. The first great principle of the measure was the disfranchising of the boroughs. Lord Lyndhurst moved that the first and second clauses of the bill be postponed. These were the disfranchising clauses; and the motion was carried against ministers by a majority of thirty-five. Lord Grey, on that Monday night, moved that the chairman of the committee should report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Thursday. His motion was carried. That interval of two days preceded a week of intense excitement, such as the country had not witnessed in any previous stages of this contest—such as had certainly not occurred in the memory of man—perhaps had not occurred since the revolution of 1688.

On the morning of the 8th of May the cabinet, not without some apprehensions of the ultimate consequences of such a proceeding, resolved upon asking the king to give his sanction to a large creation of peers. Lord Brougham^a has recorded his doubts as to this step in the following words: "I had a strong feeling of the necessity of the case, in the very peculiar circumstances we were placed in; but such was my deep sense of the dreadful consequences of the act, that I much question whether I should not have preferred running the risk of confusion that attended the loss of the bill as it then stood, rather than expose the constitution to so imminent a hazard of subversion." The king without any hesitation refused his assent to the proposition. "His majesty's resolution," says May,^b "had already been shaken by the threatening aspect of affairs, and by the apprehensions of his family and court, and he not unnaturally shrank from so startling an exercise of his prerogative." The resignation of the ministers was at once tendered to the sovereign, and the next day was formally accepted by letter.

For one week the nation was left to its conjectures, to its fears, to its anger, at the position of the government. The functions, indeed, of a government were suspended. The whig cabinet had gone out without leaving one holder of a subordinate office who would consent to join the government which the duke of Wellington had received authority from his sovereign to form. He set out with confidence upon a royal commission to endeavour to give the necessary cohesion to the variously shaped atoms whose parliamentary union had thrown out the Reform Bill. Out of the conglomeration of these, a road was to be formed over which the state carriage might travel in safety—not a macadamised road, but one constructed of round and square, smooth and rough materials, thrown together in a heap, to become serviceable when the people had sustained many accidents with fortitude, had ceased to be impatient of unavoidable obstruction, and were reconciled to what they deemed tyrannous. Of the failure of this plan the duke of Wellington gave a narrative to the house of lords on the 17th of May.

On the 15th of May it was announced in both houses that ministers had resumed their communication with his majesty. As the news went through the land the people everywhere settled down, in patience to abide the result. On the 18th Lord Grey declared in the house of lords that he now entertained a confident expectation of being able to carry the Reform Bill unimpaired and immediately. Upon what grounds did this confidence rest?

[1832 A.D.]

Lord Grey and Lord Brougham had an audience of the king at Windsor, on the 17th. The king, it is stated, was alarmed, and manifested not only emotion, but displeasure. He kept the two peers standing, contrary to usage, during their audience. He retained his private secretary, Sir Herbert Taylor, in the room during the whole time. Lord Grey and Lord Brougham declined to return to office unless the king gave a promise to the necessary creation of peers. The promise was most reluctantly given. Lord Brougham requested permission to have it in writing. The words of this document [according to Roebuck^a] were as follows: "The king grants permission to Earl Grey, and to his chancellor, Lord Brougham, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to insure the passing of the Reform Bill—first calling up peers' eldest sons. (Signed) William R., Windsor, May 17th, 1832." The power of creation was never called into exercise. The king, through Sir Herbert Taylor, employed his personal influence with the opposition peers to induce them to desist from further attempts to arrest the course of the Reform Bill. The pressure of the royal will upon the peers was unconstitutional. "This interference of the king with the independent deliberations of the house of lords was in truth," says May,^b "a more unconstitutional act than a creation of peers." But it overcame the difficulties of an alarming crisis. It saved the necessity of what was popularly called "swamping the house of lords"; it averted the manifold dangers of a continued resistance to the wishes of the people; it removed a great embarrassment from the cabinet—for unquestionably the prime minister, the lord chancellor, and others, would have hesitated to use at all, certainly to use to their full extent, the powers which were granted to them. The advice tendered by Sir Herbert Taylor was at once adopted. The duke of Wellington withdrew after his explanation on the 17th, and did not return to the house of lords till the night after the passing of the Reform Bill. His wise and patriotic example was followed by a sufficient number of peers to afford a decided majority for the ministers. On the 21st of May the discussion of the bill was resumed. The duke of Newcastle, after several of the clauses had been passed, said, with bitter irony, that he would recommend to the committee to vote all the details of the bill at once, and send it up to a third reading. The business in committee was finished on the last day of May. On the 4th of June the bill was passed by a majority of eighty-four. The commons next day agreed to the unimportant amendments proposed by the lords, and on the 7th of June the English Reform Bill received the royal assent. The Reform Act for Scotland and the Reform Act for Ireland were also quickly passed—the Scotch bill on the 13th of July, the Irish on the 18th.^c

It is now time to advert to the provisions of this famous statute, and to inquire how far it corrected the faults of a system which had been complained of for more than a half century. The main evil had been the number of nomination, or rotten boroughs enjoying the franchise. Fifty-six of these—having less than 2,000 inhabitants, and returning 111 members—were swept away. Thirty boroughs, having less than 4,000 inhabitants, lost each a member. Weymouth and Melcombe Regis lost two. This disfranchisement extended to 143 members. The next evil had been, that large populations were unrepresented, and this was now redressed. Twenty-two large towns, including metropolitan districts, received the privilege of returning two members; and twenty more, of returning one. The large county populations were also regarded in the distribution of seats, the number of county members being increased from 94 to 159. The larger counties were divided; and the number of members adjusted with reference to the importance of the constituencies.

Another evil was the restricted and unequal franchise. This too was corrected. All narrow rights of election were set aside in boroughs; and a ten-pound household franchise was established. The freemen of corporate towns were the only class of electors whose rights were reserved, but residence within the borough was attached as a condition to their right of voting. Those freemen, however, who had been created since March, 1831, were excepted from the electoral privilege. Crowds had received their freedom in order to vote against the reform candidates at the general election; they had served their purpose and were now disfranchised. Birth or servitude were henceforth to be the sole claims to the freedom of any city, entitling freemen to vote.

The county constituency was enlarged by the addition of copyholders and leaseholders, for terms of years, and of tenants-at-will paying a rent of fifty pounds a year. The latter class had been added in the commons, on the motion of the marquis of Chandos, in opposition to the government. The object of this addition was to strengthen the interests of the landlords, which it undoubtedly effected; but as it extended the franchise to a considerable class of persons, it was at least consistent with the liberal design of the Reform Act.

Another evil of the representative system had been the excessive expenses at elections. This too was sought to be mitigated by the registration of electors, the division of counties and boroughs into convenient polling districts, and the reduction of the days of polling.

It was a measure at once bold, comprehensive, moderate, and constitutional. Popular, but not democratic, it extended liberty without hazarding revolution. Two years before, parliament had refused to enfranchise a single unrepresented town; and now this wide redistribution of the franchise had been accomplished! That it was theoretically complete, and left nothing for future statesmen to effect, its authors never affirmed; but it was a masterly settlement of a perilous question. Its defects will be noticed hereafter, in recounting the efforts which have since been made to correct them; but whatever they were, no law since the Bill of Rights is to be compared with it in importance. Worthy of the struggles it occasioned, it conferred immortal honour on the statesmen who had the wisdom to conceive it, and the courage to command its success.^b

Such was the Reform Act of 1832, by which the landed interests were brought down some little way from a supremacy which had once been natural and just, but which had now become insufferably tyrannical and corrupt. As the manufacturing and commercial classes had long been rising in numbers, property, and enlightenment, it was time for them to be obtaining a proportionate influence in the government. By this act they did not obtain their due influence, but they gained much, and the way was cleared for more. Great as was the gain thus far, there was a yet mightier benefit in the proof that the will of the people, when sufficiently intelligent and united, could avail to modify the government through the forces of reason and resolution, without violence. This point ascertained, and the benefit secured, all subsided into quiet. Trade and manufactures began immediately to prosper; credit was firm, and the majority of the nation were in high hope of what might be expected from a government which had begun its reforms so nobly, and promised many more. There were some, and not a very few, who declared that the sun of England had set forever; but yet nobody could see that it was growing dark. Men in general thought that if they had ever walked in broad daylight, it was now.

The king was presently pitied and pardoned, as an old man called late to

[1832 A. D.]

the throne—more amiable than enlightened, and entangled between public duty and private affections which had been brought by the fault of others into contrariety; but, as was fitting, he never recovered his original popularity. When the Reform Bill was once secure, men no more carried a black flag with the inscription, "Put not your trust in princes"; nor a crown stuffed with straw, with the inscription "Ichabod"; but neither did they rend the clouds again with cheers for their "King William, the father of his country." There was no longer anything to fear from him; but men saw that neither was there anything to hope from him; and he was thenceforth treated with a mere decorum, which had in it full as much of compassion as of respect.

As for his ministers, they were idols, aloft in a shrine.

THE CHOLERA EPIDEMIC: PARLIAMENT DISSOLVED (1832 A.D.)

While the Reform Bill was in progress and in jeopardy, little else was thought of—except, indeed, the new plague, the cholera, which had come to overcloud all hearts, and to attract to itself some of the terror which would otherwise have been given entire to the apprehension of coming revolution. There were many in those days who would have been intensely grateful to know, first, that the cholera would have departed by a certain day, leaving them and their families in safety; and next, that revolution—by which they understood the overthrow of the whole social fabric—would not happen in their lifetime. If they could have been assured of these two immunities, they would have been quite happy, would have believed their way was clear for life, and that affairs would remain in their existing state, as long as their own generation had any concern with them. Very different from this view was that taken by braver spirits, with that truer vision given by courage and enlightenment. "The truth is," wrote Dr. Arnold,¹ in April, 1831, "that we are arrived at one of those periods in the progress of society when the constitution naturally undergoes a change, just as it did two centuries ago. It was impossible then for the king to keep down the higher part of the middle classes; it is impossible now to keep down the middle and lower parts of them. One would think that people who talk against change were literally as well as metaphorically blind, and really did not see that everything in themselves and around them is changing every hour by the necessary laws of its being." "There is nothing so revolutionary, because there is nothing so unnatural and so convulsive to society, as the strain to keep things fixed, when all the world is by the very law of its creation in eternal progress; and the cause of all the evils of the world may be traced to that natural but most deadly error of human indolence and corruption, that our business is to preserve and not to improve."

The much-dreaded cholera proved the smallest of the prominent evils of the time. Its first assault was the most violent; and then it attacked few but the vicious, the diseased, and the feeble; and it carried off in the whole fewer victims than many an epidemic, before and since, which has run its course very quietly. Before its disappearance from the United Kingdom, in fifteen months, the average of deaths was one in 3½ of those attacked; and the total number of deaths in and near London was declared to be 5,275. No return was obtained of the number in the kingdom. When it is remembered how many deaths happened in the noisome places of the towns, and in damp nooks of wretched country villages, and in the pauper haunts of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and among the starving Irish, it is clear that the disease could hardly work any appreciable effect in the open places, and among the com-

fortable classes of the kingdom. If a person of rank, or substance, or in healthy middle age, was attacked here and there, it was spoken of as a remarkable circumstance; and the cholera soon came to be regarded as a visitation on the vicious and the poor. Happily the preparations which depended on the apprehensions or the benevolence of the rich were made before that change in the aspect of the new plague—the cleansing and white-washing, the gifts of clothing and food—and the impression was made on all thoughtful minds that improved knowledge and care on the subject of health were the cause of our comparative impunity under the visitation of this plague, and that a still improved knowledge and care were the requisites to a complete impunity hereafter. Though our progress from that day to this has been slower than it ought to have been, the awakening of society in England to the duty of care of the public health must date from the visitation of the cholera in 1831-1832.⁴

Parliament was prorogued by commission on the 16th of October. The registration of the new constituency under the Reform Bill was then rapidly proceeded with, and other necessary preparations were made for a new general election, which was rendered indispensable by the passing of the bill. On the 8th of December parliament was dissolved; and then began the election, the writs being made returnable on the 29th of January, 1833. Three parties took the field: the ministerialists, or Earl Grey whigs; the tories, who now assumed the appellation of conservatives; the radicals, who were already dissatisfied, and were proclaiming that the Reform Bill did not go far enough, and must go farther, and that they would have universal suffrage and vote by ballot, or wage an eternal war against all governments. Generally, in England and Scotland, the elections were favourable to the ministerialists. Not so in Ireland, for there popular agitation was against them, and Daniel O'Connell had accused them, and continued to accuse them, of being guilty of injustice and insult towards the Irish.

THE FIRST REFORMED PARLIAMENT MEETS (1833 A.D.)

The first meeting of the reformed parliament was of itself an important era in our history. This great national representation had undergone not a partial, but a complete change. The first important struggle, in the seventeenth century, had been to reduce the royal authority below the level of parliament; the second, which had just succeeded, was to elevate the authority of the commons above that of the lords, and constitute the house of the former the real governing power of the empire. King and peers were now to form but a subsidiary part of the constitution, and that, too, only by the consent of the people at large, who recognised such checks as necessary against their own abuses of power, and it was now to be seen whether they would cordially unite with the national representatives, and be content with such measure of dictation as the great change had assigned to them.

The alterations which had been made in the popular representation were such as the reform appeared to necessitate. Of these, the greatest was in the county constituencies of England. Formerly they had been 52, which returned 94 members; but now, by the division of counties, these constituencies were increased to 82, which returned 159 members. As all boroughs having less than a population of 2,000 were to be disfranchised, 56 of these, which had returned 111 members, were no longer represented. Such boroughs as had a population of less than 4,000 and had sent two representatives, were now only to return one, and

[1833 A.D.]

under this category 30 seats were made vacant. As the number of members that composed the house of commons was not to be diminished, these 143 constituencies were transferred to the towns and districts that had increased in population and importance. In like manner, while no change was made upon Ireland, Scotland retained her former number of representatives, but with changes adapted to the increase of the population in new localities, and its diminution in the old. The mode of election was also simplified in town and country, both as to the time occupied, and the registration of voters, as also the qualifications for a vote, inhabitants of towns being entitled to the franchise who paid ten pounds of yearly rental, and of the counties, copy-holders and lease-holders to the value of forty shillings. In this way it was attempted to combine the privileges of the old agricultural and the new mercantile England; to reconcile the moneyed with the hereditary aristocracy; and so to extend the right of election as to make the house of commons what it claimed to be—the representation of the bulk of the people, as well as of its worth and intelligence.

THE COERCION BILL; THE TITHES

A coercion bill for the suppression of disturbances in Ireland was introduced into the house of lords by Earl Grey, and was there carried without opposition. The necessity of such a bill was shown by the fact that the aggregate of crimes during the preceding year amounted to upwards of nine thousand, connected with the disturbed state of the country, and that the list was on the increase. But long and loud and fierce was the opposition it met with in the commons from O'Connell and his well-jointed tail. Some of these Irish members did not hesitate to say in private that the Coercion Bill was absolutely and immediately necessary. One of the chief of them said in the hearing of several members of the house, "We, as Irish patriots and members, must oppose the bill to the utmost; but if you do not pass it, by heavens there will be no security for property or for life in Ireland!" Words to this effect being subsequently repeated, created a hurricane which will not soon be forgotten. Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill, one of the members for Hull, who had first disclosed this precious specimen of Irish sincerity, received a batch of challenges, being challenged by nearly one half of the members of the O'Connell tail; and only Lord Althorp stood forward like a man of honour, like an English gentleman, to the rescue of Mr. Hill in the house of commons. At last, on the 29th of March, the bill, being slightly altered in the commons, was read a third time and passed. Its effect was materially to decrease the number of outrageous offences that were prevalent throughout the country. Mr. Stanley now resigned the uneasy office of secretary for Ireland, and was succeeded by Sir John Cam Hobhouse. Mr. Stanley became secretary for the colonies, that place being vacated by Viscount Gode-rich, who was made lord privy-seal and advanced in the peerage by the title of Earl of Ripon.

For a long time there had been no collecting tithes in Ireland without a riot—in many cases they could not be collected at all. A resolution was now passed for exchequer bills not exceeding £1,000,000 to be issued for advancing, under certain conditions, arrears of tithes due for 1831 and 1832, subject to a deduction of 25 per cent., and the value of tithes for 1833, subject to a deduction of 15 per cent., to any person entitled to such arrears or tithes, and desirous of receiving such advances. The amount advanced was to be included in the tithe composition, so as to be repaid in the course of five years by

half-yearly instalments. Many people now said that England, besides paying its own tithe, would have to pay the Irish tithe also. Two commissions were issued, one for inquiring into the corporations of Ireland, and the other for investigating the condition of its labouring classes.

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY

An important question during this season was the abolition of negro slavery in the West Indies. It was a subject which the first reform parliament could not consistently avoid, and its final settlement had been confidently anticipated both by the friends and the enemies of the new state of things. It was also found, that the half measures already passed were unsatisfactory both to the slave and the slaveholder; for while the former had enjoyed such a portion of liberty as made him anxious to possess the whole, the latter could no longer compel the amount of service which was necessary for the full cultivation of his farms and plantations. The negroes found that they had rights secured for them by the state, and that their slavery had in many cases been exchanged into voluntary service, while the planters endeavoured to evade these restrictions, even at the double risk of provoking the wrath of the home government, and open rebellion among their own black dependents. It was certain also that these negroes were now so elevated in spirit, intelligence, and self-reliance, that they could not be reduced to their former serfage; that they were fitted for the enjoyment of that full freedom of which the previous instalments had been a promise and preparative; and that if it was not freely and peacefully accorded to them, they would soon be in a condition to extort it by force and violence. Such were the considerations, irrespective of those of humanity and duty, which had prepared the public mind of Britain for the full measure of negro emancipation. All being in readiness, Mr. Stanley, now secretary for the colonies, explained the ministerial scheme for the purpose in a committee of the whole house of commons, on the 14th of May.

On the 30th of August the Emancipation Act was passed in the lords. As yet it was not found possible, and it was perhaps not advisable, to let loose in an instant the whole negro population of the West Indies from their bondage into the enjoyment of full-grown liberty; and on this account, as well as from the resistance of the slaveholders themselves, the system of gradualism had still to be recognised in this great abolition. But the abolition itself was to be soon, and certain, and complete, while little more than the mere name of slavery was to be for a short time retained. On the 1st of August, 1834, the young children of the slaves were to be free. Of those who were still slaves, their servitude was to be changed into an apprenticeship that was to last, in the case of field slaves for seven, and of house slaves for five, years during which they were to be considered as free labourers in every respect, except in the right of changing their masters. In this way, negro slavery was speedily to expire throughout the whole British dominions. But while humanity liberated the bondman, justice was equally ready to compensate the master; and here a sacrifice was made which may well serve as an example to future ages, when some great national error is to be revoked and its injuries atoned for. It was at first proposed that the planters should be compensated for their loss of slave labour by a loan of £15,000,000 sterling; but when it was represented that this sum was inadequate, and that it could not well be repaid, the loan was converted into a gift, and the £15,000,000 into £20,000,000. Such munificence on the part of an impoverished nation, by whom it was as cheerfully and readily granted as if it had been the expenditure of a great national

[1833-1834 A.D.]

triumph, will serve as a brand for the foreheads of all future slaveholders to the end of time. If anything could cloud the joy of such an event, it was the circumstance that only thirty-one days before the Emancipation Act had passed, Wilberforce, its author and champion, had died. He had struggled through many a year, amidst despondency and despair, and finally amidst the more wasting inflictions of hope deferred, in behalf of a beloved measure on which his whole energies had been concentrated; and now, when the crowning effort was to be made, he was stretched upon a death-bed, without the hope of witnessing the result. But he was cheered with the assurance that the beloved project of his life was safe, and that in a few days the bill would be passed. It was a happy foretaste of that "Well done" for which his whole life had been a preparation; and joy as well as peace illuminated the good man's departure.^c

THE NEW POOR LAW (1834 A.D.)

The great measure of the session of parliament for 1834 was the passing of the act for "the Amendment and better Administration of the Laws relating to the Poor in England and Wales." That session was opened on the 4th of February, and concluded on the 15th of August. The speaker, in his address to the king on the day of prorogation, said that the Poor Law Amendment Bill had almost from the commencement to the close of the session occupied the unwearied attention of the commons. It was impossible, he continued, for them to approach a subject of such infinite delicacy and such immense importance "without much of apprehension, and, he might say, much of alarm." It was several years before the apprehension and alarm passed away; before the hope of the speaker could be generally entertained, "that its benefits will be as lasting as they will be grateful to all ranks and classes of society." The bill was brought in by Lord Althorp on the 17th of April.

It was absolutely necessary, he said, that there should be a discretionary power vested in some quarter to carry into effect recommendations calculated to introduce sound principles and the fruits of salutary experience into the administration of the poor laws. It was his intention therefore to propose that his majesty should be authorised to appoint a central board of commissioners, invested with extraordinary power to enable it to accomplish the object proposed. The bill introduced by Lord Althorp was founded upon the recommendations of the commissioners of inquiry. It had remained a month under the consideration of the cabinet, two of the commissioners, Mr. Sturges Bourne and Mr. Senior, occasionally attending to afford explanations. The proposition of this great measure was very favourably received by the house of commons. The second reading was carried by a large majority: ayes, 299; noes, 20.

Upon the third reading of the bill the ayes were 157, the noes 50. The duration of the measure was then limited to five years.

Between the passing of the bill by the commons on the 2nd of July and its proposed second reading by the lords, Lord Grey had retired from the government, and Lord Melbourne had become the head of the administration. It was not till the 21st that Lord Brougham moved the second reading. "My lords," he said, "I should have been unworthy of the task that has been committed to my hands, if by any deference to clamour I could have been made to swerve from the faithful discharge of this duty. The subject is infinitely too important, the interests which it involves are far too mighty, and the duty correlative to the importance of those interests which the government I

belong to has to discharge is of too lofty, too sacred a nature, to make it possible for any one who aspires to the name of a statesman, or who has taken upon himself to counsel his sovereign upon the arduous concerns of his realm, to let the dictates of clamour find any access to his breast, and make him sacrifice his principles to a covetousness of popular applause." Never were the qualities of the great orator more remarkably displayed than in this speech. Historical research, accurate reasoning, a complete mastery of facts, majestic rhetoric—all were brought to bear upon a subject which the mere utilitarian would have clothed with the repulsive precision of statistical detail. The measure was opposed by Lord Wynford; it was supported by the duke of Wellington. The house divided upon the motion for the second reading: contents, 76; non-contents, 13. During the progress of the bill through both houses, many of the clauses were strenuously resisted in committee. The amendments that were carried were however comparatively of little importance, and it finally received the royal assent on the 14th of August.

The task which his majesty had first imposed upon Lord Melbourne was one of insurmountable difficulty. It was to effect "an union in the service of the state of all those who stand at the head of the respective parties in the country." The king, in desiring Lord Melbourne "to enter into communication with the leading individuals of parties," specially mentioned the duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Stanley. In an audience upon the 9th Viscount Melbourne had laid before his majesty some of those general objections which pressed forcibly upon his mind to unions and coalitions of opposing parties. He wrote to the king on the 10th that he considered the successful termination of such an attempt utterly hopeless. He had no personal dislikes or objections; on the contrary, for all the individuals in question he entertained great respect. In consequence of the communication to Sir Robert Peel, on the 13th of July, he wrote to the king that such a union as that proposed could not, in the present state of parties and the present position of public affairs, hold out the prospect of an efficient and vigorous administration. The king admitted on the 14th that the opinions which had been stated by Sir Robert Peel and by others, of the impracticability of his proposal, had appeared to him to be conclusive. The king had evidently imagined that if he could effect such a union of parties, the question of the Irish church, upon which he had expressed himself very strongly, might be set at rest.

FIRE DESTROYS THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT (1834 A.D.)

Parliament was prorogued on the 15th of August. On the 16th of October the houses of parliament were destroyed by fire. It was between six and seven o'clock on that evening that flames were seen bursting forth from the roof of the house of lords, in that part of the building opposite to Henry VII's chapel, and in the corner next Westminster Hall. By nine o'clock all the apartments of that portion of the parliament buildings, including the Painted Chamber and the library, were in flames, and the whole interior was in a few hours destroyed. The fire extended to the house of commons, first destroying the large offices of the house, and next seizing upon the chapel of St. Stephen. When all the interior fittings were destroyed, this building, which had been famous as the seat of English legislation from the time of Edward VI, was a mere shell. It had stood in its strength and beauty like a rock amidst the sea of fire, and had arrested the force which had till then gone on conquering and overthrowing. The speaker's official residence was also partially de-

[1834 A.D.]

stroyed. There was one time when the destruction of Westminster Hall seemed almost inevitable. To those who mixed amongst the crowd in Palace Yard, and knew that the antiquities of a nation are amongst its best possessions, it was truly gratifying to witness the intense anxiety of all classes of people to preserve this building, associated with so many grand historical scenes. "Save the hall!" "Save the hall!" was the universal cry.

THE MELBOURNE MINISTRY DISMISSED (1834 A.D.)

On the 14th of November William IV, without a word of preparation, intimated to Lord Melbourne that his ministry was at an end.

The sensation produced in London by the reported dismissal of the ministry was a natural consequence of the suddenness of the act, as it presented itself to the body of the people—of its really unconstitutional character, as it appeared to thoughtful and well-informed men. On the morning of Saturday, the 15th of November—the day when the duke of Wellington was writing his confidential letter to Sir Robert Peel—the *Times* had this startling announcement, given in the words of a communication which had been received at an early hour that morning: "The king has taken the opportunity of Lord Spencer's death to turn out the ministry, and there is every reason to believe that the duke of Wellington has been sent for. The queen has done it all." The act of the king was wholly without precedent. He might have become converted to the politics of the opposition. He might have been alarmed at the possible scandal of the quarrel between the chancellor and Lord Durham. But there was no disunion in the cabinet. The ministry had retained the confidence of parliament up to the last day of the session. They had pressed no opinions upon his majesty which could be disagreeable to him. The government of Lord Melbourne had more elements of conservatism than were agreeable to many reformers, and therefore appeared unlikely to excite the fears of the king and of his court. The sovereign has a constitutional right to dismiss his ministers, but it must be on grounds more capable of justification to parliament than the simple exercise of his personal will. The suddenness of the resolve rendered an arrangement necessary which could not be justified by any precedent, except on one occasion of critical emergency in the last days of Queen Anne. The duke of Wellington, from the 15th of November to the 9th of December, was first lord of the treasury and the sole secretary of state, having only one colleague, Lord Lyndhurst, who held the great seal, at the same time that he sat as chief baron of the court of exchequer. This temporary government was called a dictatorship. "The great military commander" was told [in a speech by Lord Durham] that he "will find it to have been much easier to take Badajoz and Ciudad Rodrigo than to retake the liberties and independence of the people."

And so, as to the inevitable necessity of a dissolution, thought Sir Robert Peel. In spite of his doubts of the policy of breaking up the government of Lord Melbourne, he had become convinced that he had no alternative but to undertake the office of prime minister instantly on his arrival. He at once waited upon the king, and accepted the office of first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. With the king's permission he applied to Lord Stanley and to Sir James Graham, earnestly entreating them to give him the benefit of their co-operation as colleagues in the cabinet. They both declined. Lord Stanley manfully said: "The sudden conversion of long political opposition into the most intimate alliance—no general coincidence of principle, except upon one point, being proved to exist between us—would

[1834-1835 A.D.]

shock public opinion, would be ruinous to my own character, and injurious to the government which you seek to form." When Sir Robert arrived he found one important question practically decided—the dissolution of the existing parliament. He does not appear to have been sanguine that the indications of a very great increase of the conservative strength in the new house of commons would be sufficient to insure the stability of his government. He looked beyond the immediate present. "It would certainly be sufficient to constitute a very powerful conservative body, controlling a future government leaning upon radical support." He tried to make a government as strong as he could with conservative materials. The re-establishment, he says, of the duke of Wellington's government in 1830 would have saved him much trouble, but would have diminished the little hope he ever entertained of being able to make a successful struggle. So, amidst the reproaches of those who regarded the minister as doing them positive wrong by not reinstating them in their former offices, he constructed a ministry of which the duke's name was a tower of strength, and of which Lord Lyndhurst as chancellor gave the assurance that it would have the support of one man of great talents. The high qualities of statesmanship which distinguished Lord Aberdeen were not yet sufficiently recognised. It was not a popular ministry, but it could not be held to comprise any of that band of violent anti-reformers who would have imperilled everything by resisting the declared opinion of the prime minister that he considered the Reform Bill as a final and irrevocable measure.

THE FIRST PEEL MINISTRY (1835 A.D.)

The anticipations of Sir Robert Peel that the conservative party would be strengthened by a general election were, to a considerable extent, realised. So, also, was his apprehension that the increase of strength would not be sufficient to give stability to the new government. Before the parliament met it was calculated that the anti-ministerialists had a majority of 133, but that 82 votes were doubtful.¹ Looking at the extraordinary efforts that had been made on both sides at this general election, and at the violence of party feeling which had been necessarily called forth, it appears almost surprising that, from the opening of parliament on the 9th of February, the ministry should not have been driven from their position before the 7th of April. Temporary accommodation had been provided for the business of the two houses on the site of those destroyed by the fire on the 16th of October. On the 9th of February, when the house of commons proceeded to the election of a speaker, a larger number of members were assembled than ever had been known before to have been congregated at one time. Six hundred and twenty-two members divided on the question whether Sir Charles Manners Sutton should be re-elected, or the Right Honourable James Abercromby be chosen to fill the chair. The votes for Abercromby were 316; for Sutton, 306.

On the 24th of February the king opened the business of the session. The two last paragraphs of the king's speech expressed his majesty's reliance on the caution and circumspection which would be exercised in altering laws which affected extensive and complicated interests, and were interwoven with ancient usages; and that, in supplying that which was defective, or renovating that which was impaired, the common object would be to strengthen the foundations of those institutions in church and state which are the inheri-

[¹ Another estimate gives: conservatives, 278; liberals (anti-ministerialists), 380.]

[1835 A.D.]

tance and birthright of the people. In the house of lords Viscount Melbourne moved an amendment upon the two paragraphs, to the effect that their lordships hoped his majesty's councils would be directed in the spirit of well-considered and effective reform, and lamenting the dissolution of the late parliament, as having interrupted and endangered the vigorous prosecution of measures to which the wishes of the people were directed. This amendment was negatived without a division. In the house of commons Lord Morpeth proposed a similar amendment, which, after three nights' debate, was carried by a majority of seven, the numbers being 309 against 302. However the eloquence of Sir Robert Peel might fail to carry the complete approbation of the house of commons, it unquestionably produced a powerful effect upon the country, inducing a very general desire that a fair chance should be given to the administration for carrying forward their professions into satisfactory results. It is my first duty, said Sir Robert Peel, to maintain the post which has been confided to me; to stand by the trust which I did not seek, but which I could not decline. Receive, at least, the measures which I propose; amend them if they are defective; extend them if they fall short of your expectations. "I offer you reduced estimates, improvements in civil jurisprudence, reform of ecclesiastical law, the settlement of the tithe question in Ireland, the commutation of tithe in England, the removal of any real abuse in the church, the redress of those grievances of which the dissenters have any just ground to complain. I offer you these specific measures, and I offer also to advance, soberly and cautiously it is true, in the path of progressive improvement. I offer also the best chance that these things can be effected in willing concert with the other authorities of the state—thus restoring harmony, insuring the maintenance, but not excluding the reform, where reform is really requisite, of ancient institutions."

On the 30th of March Lord John Russell, after a debate of four nights, carried a resolution by a majority of thirty-three, that "the house do resolve itself into a committee of the whole house to consider the temporalities of the Church of Ireland." On the 3rd of April Lord John proposed a resolution in that committee "that any surplus of the revenues of the Church of Ireland not required for the spiritual care of its members, should be applied to the general education of all classes of the people without religious distinction." After a debate of two nights the resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-five. On the 7th of April the report of the committee was brought up. Lord John Russell proposed a resolution, "that it is the opinion of this house that no measure upon the subject of tithes in Ireland can lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment which does not embody the principle contained in the foregoing resolution," namely, in the resolution agreed to on the previous night. Upon the division there appeared—ayes, 285; noes, 258; majority, 27.

The division of the 7th was fatal to the existence of the ministry. Sir Robert Peel's sagacity had distinctly seen that if the government were beaten upon the motion about to be made by Lord John Russell for the alienation from ecclesiastical purposes of any surplus revenues of the Irish church, there would be no other course but for the government to resign. On the 25th of March he addressed "a cabinet memorandum" to his colleagues, in which he said: "Nothing can, in my opinion, justify an administration in persevering against a majority, but a rational and well-grounded hope of acquiring additional support, and converting a minority into a majority. I see no ground for entertaining that hope." On the 8th of April the duke of Wellington, in the house of lords, said that in consequence of the resolution

of the house of commons, the ministry had tendered their resignations to the king. Sir Robert Peel made a similar explanation to the house of commons.

LORD MELBOURNE FORMS A NEW MINISTRY (1835 A.D.)

On the 18th of April Viscount Melbourne, in moving the adjournment of the house of lords, stated that the king had been pleased to appoint him first lord commissioner of the treasury, and that he and his friends who had taken office had received from his majesty the seals of their respective departments. The other house would adjourn to the 12th of May, as some time must necessarily elapse before ministers in that house, waiting their re-election, could proceed to business. On the 12th of May the houses accordingly met. The exclusion of Lord Brougham from the ministry, by putting the great seal in commission, was necessarily the subject of popular wonder. This exclusion was not to be explained at the time; it has never been satisfactorily explained at any subsequent period. The ultra-liberals exulted that those principles which the chancellor had proclaimed at the Grey banquet had now no expression in the cabinet; the friends of education and of law reform lamented that the energy with which these great objects had been pursued was now to be confined to the independent exertions of a peer building his hope of success upon his own powers alone. It was a painful situation for one of such restless activity. To deliver elaborate judgments in the court of chancery, to be ready for every meeting of the cabinet, duly to be in his place on the woolsack at three o'clock, rarely abstaining from taking a part in debate; after the adjournment of the house to sit up half the night writing out his judgments; occasionally to dash off an article in the *Edinburgh Review*; discoursing, writing, haranguing, on every subject of politics, or science, or literature, or theology, and then suddenly to have all the duties of official life cut away from him, to sink into the state which he of all others dreaded and despised, that of a "dowager chancellor"—this, indeed, was a mortification not very easy to be borne, and we can scarcely be surprised if it were sometimes impatiently submitted to.

Nevertheless, there was a great career of usefulness before Henry Brougham. It would be a long career; and thus we look back upon the unofficial labours of this remarkable man, to whom repose was an impossibility; and, measuring him with the most untiring of recorded workers, deem it marvellous that he accomplished so much, and with few exceptions accomplished it so well. He very soon proclaimed to the world that his comparative leisure would not be a season of relaxation. On the 21st of May he submitted to the house of lords a series of resolutions on the subject of education. His speech was a most elaborate review of whatever had been done, and a practical exposition of what he thought remained to be done. In these resolutions will be found the germ of many of the principles which have become established axioms in the education of the people. The main feature of his plan was the establishment of a board of education, empowered to examine into the state of endowed charities, and to compel a due application of their funds. These resolutions collectively affirmed that although the number of schools where some of the elementary branches of education are taught had greatly increased, there was still a deficiency of such schools, especially in the metropolis and other great towns; they maintained that the education given at the greater number of the schools established for the poorer classes of the people is of a kind by no means sufficient for their instruction, being for the most part confined to

[1835 A.D.]

reading, writing, and a little arithmetic; they called upon parliament to provide effectual means of instruction, doing nothing, however, to relax the efforts of private benevolence; they set forth that for the purpose of improving the kind of education given at schools for the people at large it was necessary to establish proper seminaries for training teachers. The resolutions of Lord Brougham were favourably received by the prime minister. The bishop of Gloucester and the archbishop of Canterbury expressed their general concurrence in the eloquent and instructive speech of the noble and learned lord, but they contended that in order to make education real and useful it must be founded on the basis of religion. Lord Brougham said that he was not unaware of the difficulties which surrounded this question on the subject of religion; but that he thought he should, at a future time, be enabled to lay before them a plan by which the objections which had been urged would be obviated. We have reason to believe that, at this time, an office analogous to that of minister of public instruction might have been within the reach of Lord Brougham. It may be doubted whether even his energy could have surmounted the difficulties presented in the religious aspect of the question.

REFORM OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (1835 A.D.)

On the 5th of June the great measure of the session was proposed by Lord John Russell. He asked on behalf of his majesty's government leave to bring in a bill to provide for the regulation of municipal corporations in England and Wales. The measure proposed by the government was founded upon the report of a commission appointed by the crown, which, during a year and a half of laborious and minute investigation, had inquired into the condition of more than two hundred corporations. Lord John Russell quoted the conclusion of this report, as calling for a safe, efficient, and wholesome measure of corporation reform: "We feel it to be our duty to represent to your majesty that the existing municipal corporations of England and Wales neither possess nor deserve the confidence or respect of your majesty's subjects, and that a thorough reform must be effected before they can become, what we humbly submit to your majesty they ought to be, useful and efficient instruments of local government."

The great object of the bill proposed by Lord John Russell was to open a free course to the beneficial operation of those subordinate bodies in the government of the country which were provided in our ancient institutions as an essential counterpoise to the central authority. It has been truly said that the diffusion of political duties and political powers over every part of the body politic is like the circulation of the blood throughout the natural body. In the case of municipal corporations that healthful circulation was essentially impeded by chronic diseases which required no timid practice effectually to subdue. The object of the Municipal Reform Bill was to place the government of the towns really in the hands of the citizens themselves; to make them the guardians of their own property and pecuniary interests; to give to them the right of making a selection of qualified persons from whom the magistrates were to be chosen; in a word, to put an end to power without responsibility.

We may judge of the opposition which the Bill of Corporation Reform was likely to encounter from the mode in which it was regarded by Lord Eldon: Its interference with vested rights shocked his sense of equity even more than the sweeping clauses of the Reform Act. To regard, he said, ancient charters as so many bits of decayed parchment was, in his eyes, "a crowning

iniquity.”¹ At this distance of time it is scarcely necessary to trace the course of the Municipal Reform bill through both houses of parliament. The measure was in the house of commons from the 5th of June to the 20th of July; the great battles were fought in committee after the bill had been read a second time on the 15th of June. The chief struggle was for the preservation of the existing rights, privileges, and property of freemen. Upon the third reading there was an instructive exposition by Sir Richard Vyvyan, the member for Bristol, of the great principle upon which the bill was to be shown by the strictest of all logical proof to be utterly subversive of the constitution: It was the vice of the present bill that at the expense of one principle it went to set up another. It was an attempt to set up generally the republican principle of representation upon the ruin of the principle of vested right. It was against that principle of the bill that he mainly protested, although he considered it vicious and dangerous in many other respects. And, let him ask, would the hereditary aristocracy support the principle of a bill which was against all hereditary right? Would the peers now declare that an old charter of incorporation was worth less than a patent of nobility on which the ink is scarcely dry? The peers had now to fight their own battle. The first step that they took in this instance would be irrevocable. They would have to decide, when this bill was sent up to them, whether their lordships were to be maintained on the doctrine of temporary expediency, or to preserve their privileges upon the principle of vested right. The third reading of the bill was passed without a division.

The endeavour in the house of lords to impair the efficiency of the measure for municipal reform was sufficiently prosperous to produce the danger of such a conflict between the upper and the lower houses as had scarcely before occurred since the time of the Long Parliament. When the amendments of the peers were sent back to the house of commons—in a debate in which Lord John Russell expressed a sober indignation at the license which had permitted counsel at the bar of the peers to insult the other branch of the legislature, and Sir Robert Peel did not defend the language of the rash advocate, but maintained that it was extremely difficult to place any restriction on what counsel might please to express—Mr. Roebuck maintained that every act of the lords proved that they contemned and hated the people, and that they were determined to show this contempt and hatred by insulting the people’s representatives. The quarrel between the two houses was growing very serious. Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, much to their honour, took the part of moderators in this great dispute. Sir Robert Peel, especially, whilst he contended that they should uphold the perfect independence of the house of lords, expressed his willingness to make some concessions which would have the effect of reconciling the differences between the two houses. There were free conferences between a committee of the house of commons and managers on the part of the house of lords. After the last conference on the 7th of September, three days before the prorogation of parliament, Lord John Russell recommended that for the sake of peace, and as the bill, though deprived of much of its original excellence, was still an effective reform of municipal institutions, the house should agree to it as it then stood, reserving the right of introducing whatever improvements the working of it might hereafter show to be necessary. The Bill for Municipal Reform received the royal assent on the 9th of September.

Lord Eldon, in this perilous crisis of a contest between the peers and the

[¹ The great abilities of Lord Lyndhurst were exerted in a striking manner in his leadership of the opposition to this bill in the house of lords.]

[1835-1836 A.D.]

commons, lamented that his infirmities prevented him from going down to the house of lords—not to conciliate, not to reconcile the differences between the two houses—but to grapple with the proceedings altogether, and persuade the lords utterly to reject the bill. Sitting “pale as a marble statue,” and seeing terrible changes gradually darkening over all he had loved and venerated in corporate institutions, we may venture to inquire if the outward glories of municipal power thus departing were as dear to his troubled soul as their ancient charters. What wonderful manifestations of grandeur were presented to the admiring eyes of the people by the majority of corporations as they existed in 1835! What processions were there on every possible occasion, of red gowns and blue, with mace-bearer and beadle! To walk in togged state to church, or to proclaim an election writ, or to open a gingerbread fair; to be adorned with golden chains as mayor and aldermen sitting on high in their tribunals at quarter sessions; to look venerable, clothed in scarlet and fur, at solemn supper in open hall like the Tudor and Stuart kings, on fair-nights, holding the pie-powder court, where the “dustifoot” might go for justice—these were indeed gorgeous displays. Magnificent pageants on the mayor’s day existed in a few provincial cities and boroughs: Norwich had its “whiffers” and its “dragon.” All the ancient and modern glories were to depart; even the mayor’s feast was to be an inexpensive banquet, not defrayed out of the corporate funds. The mansion houses were to be let for warehouses. Well might the good ex-chancellor weep, having only one poor consolation, that the city of London was to be spared; that its lord mayor would still have the glorious privilege of interrupting for one day in the year the real business of three millions of people, to assert by his men-in-armour, and his pasteboard Gog and Magog, his pretended rule over a community of which only one thirtieth would be subject to his jurisdiction.

THE SESSION OF 1836

The disposition which had been manifested in the session of 1835 by the majority of the house of lords, threatening something beyond a passing difference with the majority of the house of commons, became stronger and more confirmed in the session of 1836. The compromise upon the English Municipal Reform Bill had averted, in some degree, the apprehension of a perilous conflict between the two branches of the legislature. The question of corporation reform in Ireland was to be disposed of in the session of 1836, with an absolute indifference to the opinions of the commons. In 1835, on the reading of that bill a third time in the lower house at so late a period of the session as the 13th of August, Mr. Sinclair, a Scotch member, anticipating the probable course that would be taken by the lords when in the next session it should be sent to the upper house, said that it must pass through the ordeal of an assembly in which the laws of truth and justice would not be set at nought, in which vested rights would not be invaded, in which no bill would pass for the destruction of the Protestant establishment in Ireland, by transferring the influence from property, which in a preponderating ratio was in the hands of Protestants, to Roman Catholics, who in point of numbers would in most cases obtain the pre-eminence. It is easy to judge from this declaration how sustained and bitter would be the controversy upon the subject of Irish corporations in the session of 1836, in which a new bill was brought in and passed by the house of commons on the 28th of March.

During the short administration of Sir Robert Peel he submitted to a committee of the house of commons the details of a measure for facilitating the

settlement of the vexatious tithe-question in England and Wales. He proposed to establish a commission to superintend the voluntary commutation of tithe in parishes, and to remove the impediments in the way of an easy accomplishment of such voluntary principle. The committee agreed to the proposed resolution for a payment in money in substitution for tithe, to be charged upon the titheable land in each parish, such payment to be subject to variation at stated periods according to the prices of corn. On the 9th of February, in the session of 1836, Lord John Russell introduced the government plan, which was founded upon the same principle as that of Sir Robert Peel, of a money payment instead of a payment in kind, but differing from it as establishing something more effective than a mere voluntary commutation. By the measure of Lord John Russell a voluntary commutation was in the first instance to be promoted; but in case of no such agreement a compulsory commutation was to be effected by commissioners. The object of the Tithe Commutation Act which was finally passed was to assimilate tithes as much as possible to a rent-charge upon the land. That charge was to be determined by taking the averages of the corn returns during seven preceding years; and a fixed quantity of corn having been previously determined as a proper portion for the tithe owner, the amount of money payment was to be settled by a septennial average of the price of corn. The opposition to this measure assumed no party character. The clergy did not feel their interests to be invaded. The landowner and farmer had for years complained that no institution was more adverse to cultivation and improvement than tithes, as Dr. Paley had long before declared. The clergy were disposed to believe that the plan of the same sagacious political philosopher to convert tithes into corn rents would secure the tithe-holder a complete and perpetual equivalent for his interest.

Another measure of the session of 1836, which amply refuted the opinion that legislators in either house could only look at great social questions through the mists of party, was the passing of the bill for allowing counsel to prisoners. The final debate upon the bill in the house of lords was remarkable for a most honourable declaration of Lord Lyndhurst, that his former opposition to the measure had been converted into a hearty approval of it. In an interesting volume by Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill we have a succinct and very complete history of the course of public opinion on the question of counsel to prisoners. He shows that even Judge Jeffreys had told a jury that he thought it a hard case that a man should have counsel to defend himself for a twopenny trespass, but that he should be denied counsel where life, estate, honour, and all were concerned. It was not until 1824 that any attempt was made in parliament to remove this disability under which prisoners laboured. In that year Mr. George Lamb, the brother of Lord Melbourne, brought the subject before the house of commons. He was supported by Sir James Mackintosh, Doctor Lushington, and Mr. Denman. Mr. Canning was favourable to the change, but the speech of Mr. Attorney-General Copley had converted him into an opponent of the measure. Sydney Smith in 1826 drew a picture of the cruel oppression involved in the disability of the prisoner's counsel to address a jury: "It is a most affecting moment in a court of justice when the evidence has all been heard, and the judge asks the prisoner what he has to say in his defence. The prisoner, who has (by great exertions, perhaps, of his friends) saved up money enough to procure counsel, says to the judge, that he leaves his defence to his counsel. We have often blushed for English humanity to hear the reply: 'Your counsel cannot speak for you; you must speak for yourself.' And this is the reply given to a poor girl of

[1836 A.D.]

eighteen—to a foreigner—to a deaf man—to a stammerer—to the sick—to the feeble—to the old—to the most abject and ignorant of human beings!" In 1834 the Prisoners' Counsel Bill was introduced into the house of commons by Mr. Ewart. The debate was on the second reading, when Mr. Hill, the member for Hull, seconded Mr. Ewart's motion. The measure was passed by the house of commons without a division, but was rejected by the lords. It was brought forward again by Mr. Ewart in 1835—when it dropped on account of the late period of the session—and in 1836. In the latter year it was carried by a majority of forty-four. It was then introduced to the house of lords by Lord Lyndhurst. It was on that occasion that he made his honest recantation of his former opinion. He had come to a conviction that the evils and inconveniences of allowing counsel to prisoners had been greatly exaggerated, and ought not to be put for a moment in competition with that which the obvious justice of the case so clearly demanded. Twice did the house of lords debate this question, but the measure passed without a division. Lord Abinger, formerly Mr. Scarlett, might have great doubts as to the policy of the bill, and be afraid of their lordships becoming too much in love with theory; but no expression of doubt, no plea for delay could stand up against the united opinions of such men as Lord Denman, Lord Cottenham, then chancellor, and Lord Lyndhurst. It is a remnant, said Lord Lyndhurst, of a barbarous practice. The continuance of it is against the great current of authority. It is contrary to the practice of all civilised nations. An alteration was essential to the due investigation of truth.

Vital Statistics: the Newspaper Stamp

One of the most important measures towards a more complete system of national statistics was brought forward by Lord John Russell in the session of 1836. On the 12th of February he introduced the Bill for the General Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages. At the same time he brought forward a bill for amending the law regulating the marriages of dissenters, which regulation was connected with the establishment of a general civil registration. With regard to the second bill it was shrewdly anticipated by Sir Robert Peel that, when no point of honour was concerned, many of the dissenters, particularly the female portion of them, would prefer being married in church. There were no intolerant prejudices opposed in the legislature to the passing of the bill which permitted marriages to be solemnised in the presence of the district-registrar. To the other bill no stickler for antiquity could prefer the parochial registry established by Secretary Cromwell exactly three hundred years before this measure was to come into operation, to one general system which under responsible officers should supersede the variable entries of sixteen thousand parishes, so often lost or mutilated, and so difficult to be referred to even when properly preserved. The important office of superintendent-registrar was created by this statute. The Poor-law unions were divided into districts for which registrars were appointed, with a superintendent-registrar in each union. The regulations by which a complete registration of births and deaths is accomplished are now familiar to every father and mother, and every occupier of a house in which any birth or death may happen, who are bound to furnish information of the fact to the registrar. Mr. Porter,¹ says, "The establishing of a department for the systematic registration of births, marriages, and deaths, in England and Wales, has been of great use in the examination of questions depending upon various contingencies connected with human life." Certified copies of

the entries of births and deaths are sent quarterly by the registrar to the superintendent-registrar, and by him to the registrar-general. It is from this source that we derive the knowledge of many most interesting facts connected with the progress of the population—facts which the scientific knowledge and the literary skill of the heads of the registrar-general's department have redeemed from the ordinary dulness of statistics to constitute some of the most attractive reading of the public journals. The registrar-general's annual report enables the legislature to form a tolerably accurate estimate of the increment of the population in the decennial intervals of a census.

In this session there were two most important changes proposed by the government with reference to journalism and the general commerce of literature. On the 20th of June the chancellor of the exchequer moved "that the duty payable upon every sheet whereon a newspaper is printed shall in future be one penny." The newspaper stamp for many years had been four-pence. Amongst the opponents of this measure one county member complained that already the mails were so heavily laden on a Saturday night with newspapers that it was hardly safe to travel by them. The chancellor of the exchequer had anticipated that the penny stamp would produce quite as much as the four-penny stamp. "If he is right," said Sir Charles Knightley, "then the quantity of newspapers must be more than trebled, and if so, there must be a tax raised for their conveyance." The proposition of the chancellor of the exchequer was carried by a majority of only thirty-three, and with some alterations finally passed the house of lords. The other measure was a reduction of the duty on paper. Lord Francis Egerton, himself a man of letters, in presenting a petition before the government proposition was introduced, claimed for this subject the best attention of the house on account of the effect which the state of the law produced on literature, especially upon cheap literature. By the act to repeal the existing duties on paper, which received the royal assent on the 13th of August, the varying duties according to the class or denomination were merged in one uniform duty upon all paper of three halfpence per pound. The relief to the publishers of cheap works was as timely as it was important. We may instance that it came to save the *Penny Cyclopædia* from extinction in the fourth year of its struggle against heavy loss, under the opposing conditions of paying at the highest rate for literary labour, and selling at as low a rate as that of works in which the quality of the authorship was a secondary consideration.

On the 31st of January, 1837, parliament was opened by commissioners. The most important passage in the royal speech had reference to the state of the province of Lower Canada. It is unnecessary here to enter upon the history of those discontents which ended in insurrection. Grievances were removed, and revolts were put down, at no distant period; from which time the course of events may be regarded as a whole. Few of the proceedings of parliament during a session which circumstances had rendered unusually short acquired a legislative completion. Lord John Russell proposed the government plan for introducing Poor laws into Ireland. The dissolution of parliament interrupted the progress of the bill. The chancellor of the exchequer proposed a measure for the abolition of church rates, which was strenuously opposed, and finally was abandoned by the government. Lord John Russell introduced a series of bills for the further amendment of the criminal law. These also were to stand over till another session. Only twenty-one public acts, none of which effected any important changes, received the royal assent of King William IV.

[1837 A.D.]

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM IV (1837 A.D.)

On the 9th of June a bulletin issued from Windsor castle informing a loyal and really affectionate people that the king was ill. It announced that he had suffered for some time from an affection of the chest, which had confined him to his apartment, had produced considerable weakness, but had not interrupted his usual attention to business. There was less apprehension of a serious result from it being generally known that his majesty, previous to his accession to the throne, had been subject to violent attacks of what is called the hay-fever. This malady had returned. From the 12th of June bulletins were regularly issued till the 19th. The irritation of the lungs had then greatly increased, and respiration had become exceedingly painful. By the king's express desire the archbishops of Canterbury and York prepared a prayer for his restoration to health, which, on the 16th, was ordered by the privy council to be used immediately before the litany. On Sunday, the 18th of June, the symptoms assumed a more alarming character, and it was announced in the bulletin of the 19th that his majesty on that day had received the sacrament at the hands of the archbishop of Canterbury. On Tuesday, the 20th of June, the last of these official documents was issued. His majesty had expired that morning at twelve minutes past two o'clock.

The lapse of time has enabled us to appreciate the justice of those parliamentary eulogies on the character of William IV which immediately followed his death. In the house of lords Viscount Melbourne dwelt upon his zeal and assiduity in the discharge of the public business; upon his fairness and sense of justice—"most fair, most candid, most impartial, most willing to hear, to weigh, and to consider what was urged even in opposition to his most favourite opinions." The duke of Wellington bore distinct testimony to the total absence of vindictive feelings in the late king. The opposition of the duke when prime minister to the views of the lord high admiral had compelled him to resign that great office which he was most anxious to retain; and yet on his accession he employed the duke in his service, and manifested towards him the greatest kindness. Earl Grey described him as truly "a Patriot King"—one whose most anxious desire was to decide what was best for the country over which he ruled. Lord Brougham entirely agreed in what had been said of the amiable disposition, the inflexible love of justice, and the rare candour by which the character of William IV was distinguished. In the house of commons Lord John Russell panegyricised the conduct of the late king towards his ministers as marked by sincerity and kindness. He was in the habit of stating his opinions frankly, fairly, and fully; never seeking any indirect means of accomplishing an object, but in a straightforward and manly way confined himself to an open, simple, and plain attempt to impress the minds of others with the opinion which he might at the moment entertain. If his constitutional advisers differed from him, and still continued to be his servants, he left them wholly responsible for carrying into effect the course of policy which they recommended. His devotion during his last illness to the public business was the same as it had been through his whole reign. During a period of great suffering whatever required immediate attention received immediate notice. On the last day of his life he signed one of those papers in which he exercised the royal prerogative of mercy. Sir Robert Peel bore the same testimony to the king's utter forgetfulness of all amusement, and even of all private considerations, that could for a moment interfere with the most efficient discharge of his public duties.¹

THE KING'S LIFE IN RETROSPECT

William Henry, the third son of George III, was born in August, 1765, and was therefore in his seventy-second year at the time of his death. He was destined for the sea, and became a midshipman at the age of fourteen. It is amusing to read, at this distance of time, of the distresses of the admiralty at the insubordination to rules shown by Prince William, when he had risen high enough in the service to have a ship of his own to play his pranks with. When he was two or three and twenty, he twice left a foreign station without leave, thus setting an example which might ruin the discipline of the navy, if left unpunished. But how adequately to punish a prince of the blood was the perplexity of the admiralty. They ordered him to remain in harbour at Plymouth for as long a time as he had absented himself from his proper post, and then to return to his foreign station. This was not enough; but it was thought to be all that could be done in such a case; and the prince was withdrawn from the active exercise of his profession—from that time ascending through the gradations of naval rank as a mere matter of form. For twenty years he continued thus to rise in naval rank, besides being made duke of Clarence, with an allowance from parliament of £12,000 a year.

During those twenty years, when he should have been active in his profession, he was living idly on shore, endeavouring after that enjoyment of domestic life for which he was eminently fitted, and from which our princes are so cruelly debarred by the operation of the Royal Marriage Act. The duke of Clarence was the virtual husband of Mrs. Jordan, the most bewitching of actresses, and the queen of his heart during the best part of his life. They had ten children—five sons and five daughters. It is averred by those who understand the matter well that the conduct of the duke of Clarence in his unfortunate position was as good as the circumstances permitted—that he was as faithful and generous to Mrs. Jordan as some parties declared him to be otherwise. When men place themselves in such a position, they are bound to bear all its consequences without complaint; and it is understood that the duke of Clarence endured much complaint and undeserved imputation with a patience and silence which were truly respectable. His children, the Fitz-Clarence family, were received in society with a freedom very unusual in England under such circumstances, and certainly, the strict English people appeared to be pleased rather than offended that the affectionate-hearted prince, to whom no real liberty of marriage had been left, should be surrounded in his old age by children who repaid his affection by exemplary duty and care. If this was a spectacle unfit—by the very mixture of goodness in it—for the court of England, the harm that there was in it was ascribed to the position of royalty rather than the fault of the prince, while all believed that no reparation to the purity of society could be effectually made by depriving the old man of the comfort of his children's society. Some of the family had occasion to find that forbearance could go even further than this; for they were left unhurt, except by universal censure, after their improper and foolish exertion of domestic influences against the Reform Bill and the Grey administration.

After the death of the princess Charlotte, when many royal marriages took place, in competition for the succession, the duke of Clarence married the eldest daughter of the duke of Saxe Meiningen. No issue from this marriage survived, though two infants were born only to die. For a few months, as we have seen, the duke of Clarence bore the dignity of lord high admiral; and he

[1830-1837 A.D.]

had previously performed a few holiday services on the sea by escorting and conveying royal visitors and adventurers across the Channel, and up and down in it. In politics, he had through life shown the same changeableness as in his conduct on the throne. On scarcely any subject was he firm but in his opposition to the abolition of slavery. He had not mind enough to grasp a great principle and hold to it; and, as he had not the obstinacy of his father and elder brothers, he was necessarily infirm of purpose, and as difficult to deal with in state matters as any of his family. What the difficulty amounted to, the history of the reform movement shows. In other respects, there was no comparison between the comfort of intercourse with him and with the two preceding sovereigns. He was too harebrained to be relied on with regard to particular measures and opinions; but his benevolent concern for his people, his confiding courtesy to the ministers who were with him (whatever they might be), and his absence of self-regards, except where his timidity came into play, made him truly respectable and dear, in comparison with his predecessors. When his weakness was made conspicuous by incidents of the time, it seemed a pity that he should have been accidentally made a king: but then again some trait of benignity or patience or native humility would change the aspect of the case, and make it a subject of rejoicing that virtues of that class were seen upon the throne, to convince such of the people as might well doubt it that a king may have a heart, and that some of its overflow might be for them.

The funeral took place at night on the 8th of July, the duke of Sussex being chief mourner. For the last time, the royal crown of Hanover was placed beside the imperial crown on the coffin of a king of England.





CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA

[1837-1856 A.D.]

Resplendent with glory, teeming with inhabitants, overflowing with riches, boundless in extent, the British Empire, at the accession of Queen Victoria, seemed the fairest and most powerful dominion upon earth. It had come victorious through the most terrible strife which ever divided mankind, and more than once, in the course of it, singly confronted Europe in arms. It had struck down the greatest conqueror of modern times. It still retained the largest part of the continent of North America, and a new continent in Australia had been recently added, without opposition, to its mighty domains. All the navies of the world had sought in vain to wrest from the hands of its sovereign the sceptre of the ocean; all the industry of man, to rival in competition the produce of its manufactures or the wealth of its merchants. It had given birth to steam navigation, which had bridged the Atlantic, and railways, which had more than halved distance. It had subdued realms which the Macedonian phalanx could not reach, and attained a dominion beyond what the Roman legions had conquered. An hundred and twenty millions of men, at the period of its highest prosperity, obeyed the sceptre of Alexander; as many in after-times were blessed by the rule of the Antonines; but an hundred and fifty millions peopled the realms of Queen Victoria; and the sun never set on her dominions, for before "his declining rays had ceased to illuminate the ramparts of Quebec, his ascending beams flamed on the minarets of Calcutta."—ALISON.^b

THE death of William IV, on the 20th of June, 1837, placed on the throne of England a young princess, who was destined to reign for a longer period than any of her predecessors. The new queen, the only daughter of the duke of Kent, the fourth son of George III, had just attained her majority. Educated in comparative seclusion, her character and her person were unfamiliar to her future subjects, who were a little weary of the extravagances and eccentricities of her immediate predecessors. Her accession gave them a new interest in the house of Hanover. And their loyalty, which would in any

[1819-1820 A.D.]

case have been excited by the accession of a young and inexperienced girl to the throne of the greatest empire in the world, was stimulated by her conduct and appearance. She displayed from the first a dignity and good sense which won the affection of the multitude who merely saw her in public, and the confidence of the advisers who were admitted into her presence.^o

Before we take up the political events of the new reign, we may well pause to learn something of the personality of the young sovereign who was to become in later years the most revered of monarchs.^o She was the only child of Edward, duke of Kent, fourth son of King George III, and was born in Kensington Palace, on the 24th of May, 1819. Her parents had been living at Amorbach, in Franconia, owing to the duke of Kent's straitened circumstances, but they returned to London on purpose that their child should be born in England; and the duke was so anxious for the safety of his wife that he himself drove the carriage over all the land part of the journey from Bavaria. The duchess of Kent was the princess Victoria Mary Louisa of Coburg, who had been married first to Prince Emich Karl of Leiningen, and by him had two children. The birth of the duke of Kent's baby was not considered at the time an event of much importance, for several lives and many possibilities stood between the infant and her chance of succeeding to the throne. George III was still alive—aged, blind, and insane—and two brothers of the prince regent older than the duke of Kent were living also. The first of these, the duke of York, was not likely to have children; but the duke of Clarence had been married on the same day as the duke of Kent to the princess Adelaide of Saxe-Meiningen, and he was to have two daughters, both of whom, however, died during infancy. The question as to what name the duke of Kent's child should bear was not settled without bickerings. The duke of Kent wished her to be christened Elizabeth, after England's greatest queen, but the czar Alexander I had promised to stand sponsor, and his ambassador in London, Prince Lieven, made great efforts to get the child named Alexandrina. On the other hand, the prince regent desired that his niece should be called Georgiana. In the end the regent yielded to the czar, but said that as the name of George could stand second to none, that of Georgiana should not be conferred at all. The baptism was performed in a drawing-room of Kensington Palace on 24th June by Dr. Manners Sutton, archbishop of Canterbury, who used the gold font which figures among the regalia in the Tower. The prince regent, who was present, named the child Alexandrina; then, being respectfully requested by the duke of Kent to give a second name, he said, rather abruptly, "Let her be called Victoria, after her mother, but this name must come after the other," upon which the duke of York, as proxy for the emperor of Russia, made a low bow.

Six weeks after her christening the princess was vaccinated. This was the first occasion on which a member of the royal family underwent the operation, and it helped greatly to diminish the prejudice against Jenner's discovery among ignorant people. In January, 1820, the duke of Kent died, five days before his brother, the prince regent, succeeded to the throne as George IV. The widowed duchess of Kent was no longer in her first youth. She was a woman of thirty-four, handsome, homely, a German at heart, and with little liking for English ways. But she was a woman of experience and shrewd; and, fortunately, she had in her brother, Prince Leopold of Coburg, afterwards king of the Belgians, a safe and affectionate adviser. This prince had been the husband of the princess Charlotte of Wales, daughter of the regent and direct heir to the British crown, who died in 1817 with her new-born child, and this double bereavement had destroyed both his domestic happiness and

his political expectations. In his sorrow he had never had the courage to look upon the face of his infant niece before her father's death, but from that day he took the child under his guardianship, lavishing as much devotion on her as if she had been his own daughter. The prince lived at Claremont, and this became the duchess of Kent's occasional home; but she was much addicted to travelling, and spent several months every year in visits to watering-places. It was said at court that she liked the demonstrative homage of crowds; but she had good reason to fear lest her child should be taken away from her to be educated according to the views of George IV. Between the king and his sister-in-law there was little love. The spirited duchess had never concealed her dislike for his majesty's character, or her contempt for his associates of both sexes, and she had also managed to make an enemy of the ill-natured duke of Cumberland, whom the king feared for his cutting tongue. The duke sought to embitter his brother's mind against the duchess of Kent, and when the death of the duke of Clarence's two children, in 1820 and 1821, had made it pretty certain that Princess Victoria would become queen, the duchess felt that the king might possibly obtain the support of his ministers if he insisted that the future sovereign should be brought up under masters and mistresses designated by himself.

In 1830 George IV died, and William IV having ascended the throne, the princess Victoria became his heir. A Regency bill was introduced into parliament by Lord Lyndhurst, chancellor in the duke of Wellington's administration, and it was judged that the princess ought now to be told of her proper place in the order of succession. One day the baroness Lehzen put a genealogical table into her pupil's English history. What followed is mentioned in Sir Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*:

"The princess opened the book, and perceiving the additional paper, said, 'I never saw that before.' 'It was not thought necessary that you should, madam,' answered her governess. 'I see I am nearer the throne than I thought,' continued the princess, and after some moments resumed: 'Now, many a child would boast, but they don't know the difficulty. There is much splendour, but there is more responsibility.' The princess, having lifted up the forefinger of her right hand while she spoke, gave the baroness her little hand, repeating, 'I will be good. I understand now why you urged me so much to read even Latin. My aunts, Mary and Augusta, never did; but you told me Latin is the foundation of English grammar and of all elegant expressions, and I learned it as you wished it, but I understand all better now,' and the princess gave her hand, repeating, 'I will be good.' The governess then said, 'But your aunt Adelaide is still young and may have children, and, of course, they would ascend the throne after their father, William IV, and not you, princess.' The princess answered, 'And if it were so I should not be disappointed, for I know by the love Aunt Adelaide bears me how fond she is of children.'"

Queen Adelaide was a very good woman. When the second of her children died she had written to the duchess of Kent, "My children are dead, but your child lives, and she is mine, too." Kind old William IV also cherished affectionate feelings towards his niece; unfortunately he took offence at the duchess of Kent for declining to let her child come and live at his court for several months in each year, and through the whole of his reign there was strife between the two; and Prince Leopold, who, after refusing the crown of Greece, had been induced to open a new career for himself as king of the Belgians, was no longer in England to act as peacemaker.

In May, 1837, the duchess received an address from the city of London.

[1837 A.D.]

congratulating her on the majority of her daughter, and in her reply she hinted that she had been friendless when she arrived in England, and had since that time met with kindness only from the nation, not from the royal family. Exasperated at this, the king vowed he would hold no more terms with the duchess. The amount of the princess' allowance was under discussion at the time, and the duchess desired to be appointed trustee for her daughter; but the king declared that the princess should have £10,000 a year for her own sole use uncontrolled, and he wrote her a private letter to this effect in fatherly terms. The marquis of Conyngham, lord chamberlain, bore the missive to Kensington, and the duchess of Kent held out her hand to receive it. "The king's commands are that I should deliver the letter to the princess Victoria," said Lord Conyngham as coldly as possible, and he did this. The princess had never before had an unopened letter put into her hands. Before breaking the seal she turned with an affectionate gesture towards her mother, as if to beg her permission; and eventually, by the duchess' advice, a grateful answer was written, thanking the king for his intended kindness. But the allowance was never settled, since four weeks later William IV died. The thoughts of his last hours dwelt often on his niece, and he repeatedly said that he was sure she would be "a good woman and a good queen. It will touch every sailor's heart to have a girl queen to fight for. They'll be tattooing her face on their arms, and I'll be bound they'll all think she was christened after Nelson's ship." He wanted much to see his niece at his bedside, and at twelve o'clock on Monday, the 19th, an express was sent to Kensington, commanding the princess Victoria's immediate attendance. The duchess of Kent chose to ignore this order, though she subsequently explained that the commands had not been brought to her in the king's name, and that she had not understood that his majesty was at the point of death. It had been her intention to go to Windsor on the following day, but William IV died in the night.

THE QUEEN'S ACCESSION

The king died at about 2 A.M., and half an hour afterwards Dr. Howley, archbishop of Canterbury, and the marquis of Conyngham, started in a landau with four horses for Kensington, which they reached at five o'clock. The sun broke from behind clouds and shed a glory over the old red brick palace as they drove up to it, and the archbishop noted this as a good omen. Lord Conyngham observed that the proclamation would take place on the morrow, the first day of summer and the longest day of the year, which was of happy augury, too. For a long time, however, the two dignitaries who came to hail the girl-queen could not rouse the porter at the gate. Their servants rang, knocked, and thumped; and when at last admittance was gained, the primate and the marquis were shown into a lower room and there left to wait. Presently a maid appeared and said that the princess Victoria was "in a sweet sleep and could not be disturbed." Dr. Howley, who was nothing if not pompous, and who, being attired in his rochet, was vexed that this garment had not obtained for him more respectful treatment, answered with some warmth that he had come on state business, to which everything, even sleep, must give place. The princess was accordingly roused, and quickly came downstairs in a dressing-gown, her fair hair flowing loose over her shoulders. The duchess of Kent accompanied her, likewise *en deshabille*, and in a few minutes the ever-vigilant Baroness Lehzen entered upon the scene with a bottle of *sal volatile*, and the words "Your majesty" gushing from her lips.

[1837 A.D.]

The young queen shed tears on hearing the archbishop's very solemn announcement, and for a few moments she stood weeping in silence, with her face resting on her mother's shoulder. "I felt no exultation, but something like fear," she wrote a few days later to her uncle Leopold.

She was then in her nineteenth year, of pleasing countenance without being pretty, and of dignified deportment without constraint in her movements. She had blue eyes and a rosy complexion; she smiled readily, and had a gentle, wistful glance, which always seemed to solicit the approbation of those to whom she spoke, and turned quickly to astonishment or sadness if she met no genial response. Her dancing mistress, Mlle. Bourdin, had taught her to walk, bow, and curtsy in the French fashion—that is, with gracious inclinations of the head and cheerful looks (which were contrary to the etiquette of German courts, where everything used to be done with rigid gravity), but the happy vivacity of the princess's disposition prevented any of her gestures from appearing artificial. She was always natural and waived etiquette whenever it interfered with a free display of her impulses towards anybody whom she loved or honoured. Her demeanour throughout the trying day when she succeeded to the throne excited general admiration.

The privy council assembled at Kensington at eleven o'clock; and the usual oaths were administered to the queen by Lord Chancellor Cottenham, after which all present did homage. There was a touching incident when the queen's uncles, the dukes of Cumberland and Sussex, two old men, came forward to perform their obeisance. The queen blushed to the brow, and descending from her throne, kissed them both, without allowing them to kneel. By the death of William IV the duke of Cumberland had become



king of Hanover, and immediately after the ceremony he made haste to reach his kingdom. Within a fortnight of his arrival there he had revoked the constitution of the country, and wrote to his friend, the duke of Buckingham, boasting that he had "cut the wings of democracy." Had Queen Victoria died without issue, this prince, who was arrogant, ill-tempered, and rash, would have become king of Great Britain; and, as nothing but mischief could have resulted from this, the young queen's life became very precious in the

[1837 A.D.]

sight of her people. She, of course, retained the late king's ministers in their offices, and it was under Lord Melbourne's direction that the privy council drew up their declaration to the kingdom. This document described the queen as Alexandrina Victoria, and all the peers who subscribed the roll in the house of lords on 20th June swore allegiance to her under those names. It was not till the following day that the sovereign's style was altered to Victoria simply, and this necessitated the issuing of a new declaration and a re-signing of the peers' roll.

The public proclamation of the queen took place on the 21st at St. James' Palace with great pomp, and it proved a severe ordeal for the nerves of a delicate girl still under her mother's care. Crowds lined the whole route from Kensington, which then stood quite in the suburbs; and from Hyde Park Corner, where the masses became more dense, the young queen, in her open carriage, was greeted with cheers so loud and hearty that by the time she reached St. James' she was trembling with emotion. She appeared at a window in the courtyard of the palace, dressed in deep mourning, with a white tippet, white cuffs, and a border of white lace under her small black bonnet; and everybody noticed how pale she was. Sir Ralph Bigland, garter king, made his proclamation, according to the quaint old forms in presence of the lord mayor of London and sheriffs, the great officers of state, and a cohort of heralds; and when his concluding words were followed by a blare of trumpets and the acclamations of a loyal crowd thronging all the approaches to the palace, the queen's fortitude for a moment forsook her. It was in allusion to this that Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote her pretty lines about the child-queen who "wept to wear a crown."^d

The funeral of William IV had taken place at Windsor on the 9th of July. On the 17th the queen went in state to parliament. The chronicles of the time are eloquent in their descriptions of the enthusiasm with which her majesty was received, and of the extraordinary concourse of ladies of rank in the house of lords to do honour to the rare occasion of the presence there of the third female sovereign who had thus met the lords and commons assembled in parliament. In the speech from the throne her majesty stated that amongst the useful measures which parliament had brought to maturity she regarded with peculiar interest the amendment of the criminal code and the reduction of the number of capital punishments. She hailed this mitigation of the severity of the law as an auspicious commencement of her reign. "It will be my care," she said, "to strengthen our institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, by discreet improvement wherever improvement is required, and to do all in my power to compose and allay animosity and discord." These words were the key-note of that harmony which, during the progress of a quarter of a century, superseded in a great degree the harsh discords which had too long distinguished the contests of parties and of principles. The parliament was prorogued, and was dissolved the same evening.

The ministry which Queen Victoria found at her accession was one whose general character was in harmony with the opinions in which she had been educated. Viscount Melbourne, the first lord of the treasury, was at her hand to guide and assist her in the discharge of the technical business of her great office. The daily duties of the sovereign are of no light nature. Many of the complicated details of the various departments of the state must pass under the eye of the constitutional monarch for approval, and a vast number of documents can only receive their validity from the signature of the sovereign. During the elections, which were over early in August, the party contests assumed a tone not entirely constitutional; for the adherents of the ministry

[1837 A.D.]

alleged to their constituents that in supporting them they were exhibiting their loyalty to the queen, whilst the adverse party maintained that her majesty had only passively adopted that administration of her uncle which she found established. But amidst these fluctuating demonstrations of political management there was one feeling predominant, which was certainly favourable to the duration of the ministry—that of a deep and growing attachment to the person of the young sovereign.⁶

If the kindliness and open heart of William IV had been refreshing after the temper and manners of his predecessors, the youthfulness and gaiety of the new sovereign were now really exhilarating after the spectacle of so many years of a feeble old man in the royal carriage. At first the queen was in high spirits, liking to see and be seen, driving in the parks when they were most thronged, dining at Guildhall, and saying, as she went down to open the parliament, "Let my people see me." There were smiles on her face, and she met nothing but smiles and acclamations. On the 9th of November, when she went to dine at Guildhall, London did not look like itself, with its gravelled streets, and avenues of green boughs and flags; and the old hall itself, usually so dingy and dirty, seemed to have grown young for the occasion—brilliant as it was with decorations, with crimson cloth and silk, with flags and banners, and armour glittering among the innumerable lights. Under the magnificent canopy, in the gorgeous chair of state, was seen no portly elderly gentleman, fatigued almost before the festivities had begun; but the slight figure of the young girl, all health and spirits, who half rose and bowed round to her relations—her mother, her uncles, aunts, and cousins—when the health of the royal family was proposed. There were reviews in the parks, where all London seemed to have poured out to see the queen, who, as was always said, "looked remarkably well," and enjoyed the greetings of her subjects. Then (on June 28th) there was the coronation—that bright day when there was not standing-room left for another spectator anywhere within view of any part of the pageant, and yet no accident of the smallest consequence happened from morning till night: an early morning and a late night; for the first rays of the midsummer sun that slanted down through the high windows of Westminster Abbey shone upon the jewels of whole rows of peeresses, and upon scarlet uniforms scattered among court dresses, and church vestments, and splendid female array, and the illuminations of that night were not out when the next sun rose. It was a day of great fatigue and excitement; but all present in the Abbey defied fatigue, for all hoped that this might be the last coronation they might ever have the opportunity of seeing.⁷

To be sure the splendours which had attended the coronation of George IV were to some extent dispensed with. There was no solemn procession of the estates of the realm. There was no banquet in Westminster Hall, with its accompanying feudal services. But there was a gorgeous cavalcade which more than realised the pomp of ancient times, when the king came "from the Tower of London to his palace at Westminster through the midst of the city, mounted on a horse, handsomely habited, and bare-headed, in the sight of all the people." Charles II was the last king who thus went to his coronation in procession from the Tower. Queen Victoria went from Buckingham Palace through the line of streets from Hyde Park Corner, where the houses were not hung with tapestry, as of old, but where galleries and scaffolding were raised throughout the line, and the windows were filled with ladies whose enthusiasm was as hearty as that to which Elizabeth bowed. Never were the streets more crowded. Never were the cheers of an enormous multitude—swelled, it is said, by two hundred thousand persons from the country—more deafening

[1837 A.D.]

than when the queen passed along; the last of a cavalcade in which, next to herself, the persons most greeted by the popular voice were the duke of Wellington and his old opponent Marshal Soult, who came as a special ambassador on this occasion. The day was remarkable, not only for the entire absence of accidents, but for the wonderful forbearance of that class who are most usually active on public occasions; there being only seven persons brought to the police stations for picking pockets. The day was observed throughout the kingdom as a general holiday; with public dinners, feasts to the poor, and brilliant illuminations.

Parliament was prorogued by the queen in person on the 16th of August. The chief measures which had occupied the discussions in both houses were the settlement of the civil list and the state of Canada. Other measures, which provoked less conflict, were not less important. In his review of the measures of the session the speaker emphatically dwelt upon the provision made for the destitute in Ireland. He said that no measure like the introduction of a poor law into a country circumstanced as Ireland is with respect to the number and condition of its population, could be proposed without incurring heavy responsibility; but that looking at what



QUEEN VICTORIA

(1819-1901)

had been done on this subject by former parliaments with respect to England, they had thought that the time was come when they might legislate for Ireland with safety and with a reasonable prospect of success. The Irish Poor-law statute was in great degree founded upon three comprehensive reports of Mr. Nicholls. The speaker expressed a hope that the execution of that most im-

portant law would be watched over and guided by the same prudent and impartial spirit which governed the deliberations which led to its enactment. It was felt by every one conversant with the subject that no better prospect could be afforded of the probable realisation of this hope than the immediate determination of the government that Mr. Nicholls should proceed to Ireland for the purpose of carrying the new law into operation, which he had, in great part, planned, basing it upon the most searching inquiry and the most careful consideration. Amongst the other important measures of the session were a mitigation of the law of imprisonment for debt; the abridgment of the power of holding benefices in plurality; and the abolition of composition for tithes in Ireland, substituting rent-charges payable by those who had a perpetual interest in the land. In his address to her majesty the speaker adverted to "the improving opinions and increasing knowledge of the educated classes of the community." He probably considered that the time was distant when there would be "improving opinions and increasing knowledge" amongst the bulk of the population who could scarcely be recognised as "educated classes."

In the months which immediately followed the queen's accession news reached England of disturbances or even insurrection in Canada. The rising was easily put down; but the condition of the colony was so grave that the ministry decided to suspend the constitution of Lower Canada for three years, and to send out Lord Durham with almost dictatorial powers. Lord Durham's conduct was, unfortunately, marked by indiscretions which led to his resignation; but before leaving the colony he drew up a report on its condition and on its future, which practically became a text-book for his successors, and has influenced the government of British colonies ever since. Nor was Canada the only great colony which was seething with discontent. In Jamaica the planters, who had sullenly accepted the abolition of slavery, were irritated by the passage of an act of parliament intended to remedy some grave abuses in the management of the prisons of the island. The colonial house of assembly denounced this act as a violation of its rights, and determined to desist from its legislative functions. The governor dissolved the assembly, but the new house, elected in its place, reaffirmed the decision of its predecessor; and the British ministry, in face of the crisis, asked parliament in 1839 for authority to suspend the constitution of the island for five years. The bill introduced for this purpose placed the whig ministry in a position of some embarrassment. The advocates of popular government, they were inviting parliament, for a second time, to suspend representative institutions in an important colony. Supported by only small and dwindling majorities, they saw that it was hopeless to carry the measure, and they decided on placing their resignations in the queen's hands.

THE BEDCHAMBER QUESTION

On the 7th of May Lord John Russell announced the resignation of ministers upon the ground of not having such support and such confidence in the house of commons as would enable them efficiently to carry on the public business. Upon the resignation of her servants the queen had consulted the duke of Wellington, who recommended that Sir Robert Peel should be sent for. The attempt to form a new administration failed, and Lord Melbourne and his colleagues returned to power in a week. On the 13th Sir Robert Peel, having received her majesty's permission to explain the circumstances under which he had relinquished the attempt to form an administration, made that

[1839 A.D.]

explanation in the house of commons. The queen's most ingenuous truthfulness was conspicuous in these negotiations. Her majesty at once asked Sir Robert Peel whether he was willing to undertake the duty of forming an administration, at the same time telling him that it was with great regret that she parted with the administration which had just resigned. The next day Sir Robert submitted to her majesty the names of those he proposed to associate with him. No objection was raised as to the persons who were to compose the ministry or to the principles on which it was to be conducted. But a difficulty suggested itself to the minds of Sir Robert and his friends. He again waited upon the queen to state to her majesty the necessity of making some change in the appointment of ladies to fill the great offices of her household.

Her majesty consulted her ministers, and on the 10th wrote the following note: "The queen, having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bedchamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings." Sir Robert, it seems, took an especial objection that the wife of Lord Normanby, lord lieutenant of Ireland, and the sister of Lord Morpeth, the chief secretary, were in the closest attendance upon the queen. He and his party had wholly disapproved the policy of conciliation which was advocated by the Irish administration, and they thus objected to the continued position about the royal person of the marchioness of Normanby and the duchess of Sutherland. Upon the abstract constitutional question it is now generally felt that Sir Robert Peel was right. Immediately after he had declared his inability to form an administration unless the ladies of the bedchamber were removed, the ministry recorded their opinion in a cabinet minute that they held it "reasonable that the great offices of the court, and situations in the household held by members of parliament, should be included in the political arrangements made in a change of the administration; but they are not of opinion that a similar principle should be applied or extended to the offices held by ladies in her majesty's household." The cabinet had precedents to support their view. Lady Sunderland and Lady Rialton had remained in the bedchamber of Queen Anne for a year and a half after the dismissal of their husbands from office, and it was the uniform practice that the ladies of the household of every queen consort should be retained on changes of administration, notwithstanding their relationship to men engaged in political life.

The discussions in and out of parliament which arose upon this question were protracted and violent. The people generally were inclined to think that an attempt had been made to treat the queen with harshness by removing from her presence ladies who had become her personal friends—ladies exemplary in their private lives, and whose accomplishments shed a grace over the court of a female sovereign. Meetings were held in various parts of the country to express approbation of her majesty's conduct. These were no doubt to some extent meetings influenced by political considerations; but the sentiments there expressed were consonant with the general opinion that the queen was worthy of the most respectful sympathy with her actions and feelings. It is painful to relate that from this period was manifested, on the part of some who, disdaining the name of conservatives, clung to the extremest tory opinions, a virulence that did not even exempt from their personal attacks the conduct and character of the sovereign. To those of the present day who have not traced the course of politics in the early part of the queen's reign it would seem impossible to believe that a member of parliament,

[1839 A.D.]

at a public dinner at Canterbury, should have designated the sovereign who at a later day secured to an unparalleled extent the love and veneration of her subjects, as one who thought that if the monarchy lasted her time it was enough; that this party firebrand should have been cheered when he talked of the abdication of James II as a precedent not to be forgotten. It would seem impossible to imagine that the colonel and officers of a regiment should have brought themselves under the censure of the commander-in-chief for having sat at a conservative dinner, at Ashton-under-Lyne, to listen to "expressions most insulting and disrespectful towards the queen."⁶ But the ladies of the bedchamber were unpopular, and the public took alarm at the notion that the queen had fallen into the hands of an intriguing coterie. Lord Melbourne, who was accused of wishing to rule on the strength of court favour, resumed office with diminished prestige.

There can be no doubt that the queen was badly advised in this emergency. Sir Robert Peel could not be expected to govern while the queen kept about her person ladies who were related to his political opponents. One of the bedchamber ladies was wife of Lord Normanby, the colonial secretary, another was sister to Lord Morpeth, the chief secretary for Ireland, and the warm friendship which the queen proclaimed for these ladies was not a reassuring thing, constitutionally speaking. The tories thus felt aggrieved; and the chartists also were so prompt to make political capital out of the affair that large numbers were added to their ranks. On 14th June Mr. Attwood, M.P. for Birmingham, presented to the house of commons a chartist petition alleged to have been signed by 1,280,000 people. It was a cylinder of parchment of about the diameter of a coach-wheel, and was literally rolled up the floor of the house. On the day after this curious document had furnished both amusement and uneasiness to the commons, a woman, describing herself as Sophia Elizabeth Guelph Sims, made application at the Mansion house for advice and assistance to prove herself the lawful child of George IV and Mrs. Fitzherbert; and this incident, trumpery as it was, added fuel to the disloyal flame then raging.

The year 1839 was one of the most trying through which the queen passed. Going in state to Ascot she was hissed by some ladies as her carriage drove on to the course, and two peeresses, one of them a tory duchess, were openly accused of this unseemly act. Meanwhile some monster chartist demonstrations were being organised, and they commenced on 4th July with riots at Birmingham, which lasted ten days, and had to be put down by armed force. They were followed by others at Newcastle, Manchester, Bolton, Chester, and Macclesfield.

THE QUEEN'S MARRIAGE

These troublous events had the effect of hastening the queen's marriage. There prevailed a feeling that the court was too much under the control of women, and ministers were anxious to be relieved of the delicate responsibility of guiding the young queen in domestic matters. Their position towards the duchess of Kent was one of daily embarrassment. The duchess had no officially recognised power, but so long as her daughter remained unmarried her will in the royal household was paramount, and there were occasions—as in the bedchamber affair—when domestic matters trenched to a dangerous extent on politics. Lord Melbourne, who had publicly borne the odium of the "bedchamber plot," was in reality very loath to be rated as a court favourite, and his paternal attachment to the queen had made him view with con-

[1839 A.D.]

cern the occurrences which had caused her name to be too freely bandied about. Accordingly, when he had ascertained that the queen's dispositions towards her cousin, Prince Albert, were unchanged, he advised King Leopold that the prince should come to England and press his suit. The prince arrived with his brother on a visit to Windsor on 10th October, 1839; but he had no idea that a speedy marriage was to result from this journey. A few weeks previously the queen had written to her uncle, and said emphatically that she could entertain no project of matrimony for at least four years, and this having been reported to Prince Albert, he was under the impression that the queen meant to break off their engagement, and that he had been summoned in order that a communication to this effect might be made to him in the most considerate manner possible. In the course of three days, however, he made such good use of his opportunities that he carried his lady's heart by storm.

He had much improved since his last visit in 1836. He was no longer boyish, but tall and handsome, with a look of high intelligence in his clear, blue eyes and expansive forehead. On the evening of his arrival the queen wrote, with significant emotion, to King Leopold: "Albert's beauty is most striking, and he is most amiable and unaffected—in short, very fascinating." After this it is not surprising that on the 14th her majesty should have informed Lord Melbourne that she had made up her mind. "I am very glad of it," answered the premier, with fatherly enthusiasm; "the news will be

very well received, for I hear that there is great anxiety now that this thing should be; and you will be much more comfortable, for a woman cannot stand alone, whatever her position may be." It was not till the following day that Prince Albert himself was apprised of the queen's intentions. The proposal had to come from her, and maiden modesty being in conflict with royal etiquette, there was a natural timidity in her manner of approaching the moment which was to settle her life's course. The prince had been hunting in the morning, and when he returned at noon he was summoned to the queen's sitting-room, where he found her alone. She began by talking on different subjects to gain time. M. Daguerre's invention for taking pictures by sunlight—not yet called "photography"—was then a new thing, and some daguerreotypes which had been exhibited to the queen that morning lay on the table. Having shown these, she spoke of the great tournament which



PRINCE ALBERT

(1819-1861)

[1839-1840 A.D.]

had lately been held at Eglinton Castle, and of Lady Seymour, the "queen of beauty"; then suddenly, after a pause, she said in German, with tears in her eyes, "Could you forsake your country for me?" The prince's answer was to take her in his arms, and all ended so happily, that, once more writing to her uncle an hour or two later, the queen could say: "I love him more than I can tell, and I shall do everything in my power to render this sacrifice (for such in my opinion it is) as small as I can. I think—and Albert approves—that we ought to be married very soon after parliament meets, at the beginning of February."

The marriage was solemnised on 10th February, 1840, in the Chapel Royal, St. James'. The queen was dressed entirely in articles of British manufacture. Her dress was of Spitalfields silk; her veil of Honiton lace; her ribbons came from Coventry; even her gloves had been made in London of English kid—a novel thing in days when the French had a monopoly in the finer kinds of gloves.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

From the time of her marriage the queen began to take a really active part in the affairs of state. Previously, her ministers had tried to spare her all disagreeable and fatiguing business. Death warrants were not submitted for her signature, and though she spent an hour or two every morning writing her name on public documents, these were seldom read to her, nor did she ask to be informed of their contents. Lord Melbourne saw her every day, whether she was in London or at Windsor, and he used to explain all current business in a benevolent, chatty manner, which offered a pleasant contrast to the style of his two principal colleagues, Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston. Lord John was never a lady's man. His natural kindness was concealed under a somewhat sour air; the tone of his voice was piping and dictatorial. He was always in earnest about trifles. Lord Palmerston was a *persifleur*. Handsome, affable, well dressed, and cool, there was a point of irony in his tone as if he felt he were playing a comedy in talking to the queen about serious things which a girl of her age could not be expected to understand, and in asking her for an approval which she could not refuse. Lord Melbourne always guarded himself against the presumption of seeming to expect approval as a matter of course. The words, "Your majesty," sounded on his lips much like "My dear," but when the queen had given assent to his proposals he showed the same kind of pleasure as a fond guardian who is glad to find his ward in harmony with him. Lord Melbourne failed as a party leader, but not as a queen's minister, and it may be questioned whether a statesman of firmer mould would have succeeded so well as he did in making rough places smooth for Prince Albert. Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston were jealous of the prince's interference—and of King Leopold's and Baron Stockmar's exercised through him—in state affairs: but Lord Melbourne took the common-sense view that a husband will control his wife whether people wish it or not. He did not object to the prince being present when he opened his despatch-box before the queen; and, knowing what soreness existed in her majesty's mind against the tories, he strove to mollify the prince's feelings towards a party who might soon come to office. In this he behaved admirably, and he displayed wisdom, though the royal pair hardly appreciated it at the time, in desiring that the queen should retain the baroness Lehzen as her private secretary.

The duchess of Kent, after her daughter's marriage, retired to Ingestre House, Belgrave square, and the queen gave the baroness some hints that

[1840 A.D.]

she might retire, too, on a pension, resigning her secretaryship to Prince Albert. Lord Melbourne thought, however, that the office of private secretary held by a prince would seem to the public too much like a secretaryship of state, and would in any case bring the queen's consort into relations neither dignified nor agreeable with all sorts of people. A great part of a secretary's business consists in writing refusals to importunate requests. To confer on Prince Albert every honour that the crown could bestow, and to let him make his way gradually into public favour by his own tact, was the advice which Lord Melbourne gave; and the prince acted on it so well, avoiding every appearance of intrusion, and treating men of all parties and degrees with urbanity, that within five months of his marriage he obtained a signal mark of the public confidence. In expectation of the queen becoming a mother a bill was passed through parliament providing for the appointment of Prince Albert as sole regent in case the queen, after giving birth to a child, died before her son or daughter came of age.⁴

THE PENNY POST (1840 A.D.)


A few weeks before the time of the queen's marriage the people of the United Kingdom had arisen one morning (the 10th of January, 1840) in the possession of a new power—the power of sending by the post a letter not weighing more than half an ounce upon the prepayment of one penny, and this without any regard to the distance which the letter had to travel. To the sagacity and the perseverance of one man, the author of this system, the high praise is due, not so much that he triumphed over the petty jealousies and selfish fears of the post-office authorities, but that he established his own convictions against the doubts of some of the ablest and most conscientious leaders of public opinion. The government adopted his views reluctantly, strengthened in their hesitation by such a clear-headed supporter of the government as Sydney Smith. Temperate opposers of the government, such as the duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, saw great danger and little good in the project. Mr. Rowland Hill in 1837 published his plan of a cheap and uniform postage. A committee of the house of commons was appointed in 1837, which continued its inquiries throughout the session of 1838, and arrived at the conviction that "the mode recommended of charging and collecting postage, in a pamphlet published by Mr. Rowland Hill," was feasible, and deserving of a trial under legislative sanction.¹ The committee examined a great number of mercantile and other authorities, the questions and answers contained in their report amounting to nearly twelve thousand. There were necessarily strong differences of opinion amongst the witnesses, many even of the most favourable to a reduction to a uniform rate considering that a penny postage was too low. Lord Ashburton, although an advocate of post-office reform, held that the reduction to a penny would wholly destroy the revenue. Lord Lowther, the postmaster-general, thought twopence the smallest rate that would cover the expenses. Colonel Maberly, the secretary to the post-office, considered Mr. Hill's plan a most preposterous one and maintained that if the rates were to be reduced to a penny, the revenue would not recover itself for forty or fifty years. The committee, after a long struggle between its members, negatived both a penny and a three-halfpenny rate as inadequate, and finally recommended the adoption of a twopenny rate.

Public opinion, however, had been brought so strongly to bear in favour of a penny rate, that the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice, on July

[¹ The rapid extension of railroads made improvement in the postal service the more urgent.]

[1840 A.D.]

5th, 1839, proposed a resolution, "that it is expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of a penny postage, according to a certain amount of weight to be determined—that the parliamentary privilege of franking should be abolished, and that official franking be strictly limited—the



COSTUME OF A DANDY

(1840)

house pledging itself to make good any deficiency that may occur in the revenue from such reduction of the postage." A bill was accordingly passed to this effect in the house of commons, its operation being limited in its duration to one year, and the treasury retaining the power of fixing the rates at first, although the ultimate reduction was to be to one penny. This experimental measure reduced all rates above fourpence to that sum, leaving those below fourpence unaltered. With this complication of charge the experiment could not have a fair trial, and accordingly on January 10th, 1840, the uniform half-ounce rate became by order of the treasury one penny. The final accomplishment of this great reform presented a signal example of the force of public opinion when brought to bear upon a subject unconnected with party feelings, and the demonstration of whose necessity had been established not by passionate appeals for public support and sympathy, but by patient investigation and conclusive reasoning. This was the high merit of the man who conceived the scheme of post-office reform; and the manifest earnestness of his character, and the invincibility of his logic, mainly conduced to establish those convictions in the public mind which eventually settled all doubts. Lord Melbourne, in moving the second reading of the bill, assigned as a conclusive answer to the question, how he could venture to tamper with so large a sum as that derivable

from the post-office revenue, that "there was such a general demand from all classes of the community for a measure of this nature, that it was a very difficult matter to withstand it." In 1840 the number of letters sent through the post had more than doubled, and the legislature had little hesitation in making the act of 1839 permanent, instead of its duration being limited to the year which would expire in October. A stamped envelope, printed upon a peculiar paper, and bearing an elaborate design, was originally chosen as the mode of rendering prepayment convenient to the sender of a letter. A simpler plan soon superseded this attempt to enlist the fine arts in a plain business operation. The plan of prepaying letters by affixing a stamp bearing the head of the ruler of the country came into use in May, 1840.⁶

FISCAL POLICY

In 1840 the ministry was not much more successful than it had proved in 1839. After years of conflict it succeeded indeed in placing on the statute book a measure dealing with Irish municipalities. But its success was purchased

[1840-1841 A.D.]

by concessions to the lords, which deprived the measure of much of its original merit. The closing years of the whig administration were largely occupied with the financial difficulties of the country. The first three years of the queen's reign were memorable for a constantly deficient revenue. The deficit amounted to £1,400,000 in 1837; to £400,000 in 1838, and to £1,457,000 in 1839. Mr. Baring, the chancellor of the exchequer, endeavoured to terminate this deficiency by a general increase of taxation, but this device proved a disastrous failure. The deficit rose to £1,842,000 in 1840. It was obvious that the old expedient of increasing taxation had failed, and that some new method had to be substituted for it. This new method Mr. Baring endeavoured to discover in altering the differential duties on timber and sugar, and substituting a fixed duty of 8s. per qr. for the sliding duties hitherto payable on wheat. By these alterations he expected to secure a large increase of revenue, and at the same time to maintain a sufficient degree of protection for colonial produce. The conservatives, who believed in protection, at once attacked the proposed alteration of the sugar duties. They were reinforced by many liberals, who cared very little for protection, but a great deal about the abolition of slavery, and consequently objected to reducing the duties on foreign or slave-grown sugar. This combination of interests proved too strong for Mr. Baring and his proposal was rejected. As ministers, however, did not resign on their defeat, Sir Robert Peel followed up his victory by moving a vote of want of confidence, and this motion was carried in an exceptionally full house by 312 votes to 311.

Before abandoning the struggle, the whigs decided on appealing from the house of commons to the country. The general election which ensued largely increased the strength of the conservative party. On the meeting of the new parliament in August, 1841, votes of want of confidence in the government were proposed and carried in both houses; the whigs were compelled to resign office, and the queen again charged Sir Robert Peel with the task of forming a government. If the queen had remained unmarried, it is possible that the friction which had arisen in 1839 might have recurred in 1841. Now, however, she was no longer dependent on the whig ladies, to whose presence in her court she had attached so much importance in 1839. By the management of the prince—who later in the reign was known as the prince consort—the great ladies of the household voluntarily tendered their resignations; and every obstacle to the formation of the new government was in this way removed.

Thus the whigs retired from the offices which, except for a brief interval in 1834-35, they had held for eleven years. During the earlier years of their administration they had succeeded in carrying many memorable reforms: during the later years their weakness in the house of commons had prevented their passing any considerable measures. But, if they had failed in this respect, Lord Melbourne had rendered conspicuous service to the queen. Enjoying her full confidence, consulted by her on every occasion, he had always used his influence for the public good; and perhaps those who look back now with so much satisfaction at the queen's conduct during a reign of unexampled length, imperfectly appreciate the debt which in this respect is owed to her first prime minister. The closing years of the whig government were marked by external complications. A controversy on the boundary of Canada and the United States was provoking increasing bitterness on both sides of the Atlantic. The intervention of Lord Palmerston in Syria, which resulted in a great military success at Acre, was embittering the relations between France and England, while the unfortunate expedition to Afghan-

[1841-1844 A.D.]

istan, which the whigs had approved, was already producing embarrassment, and was about to result in disaster. Serious, however, as were the complications which surrounded British policy in Europe, in the East, and in America, the country, in August, 1841, paid more attention to what a great writer called the "condition of England" question. There had never been a period in British history when distress and crime had been so general. There had hardly ever been a period when food had been so dear, when wages had been so low, when poverty had been so widespread, and the condition of the lower orders so depraved and so hopeless, as in the early years of the queen's reign. The condition of the people had prompted the formation of two great associations. The chartists derived their name from the charter which set out their demands. The rejection of a monster petition which they presented to parliament in 1839 led to a formidable riot in Birmingham, and to a projected march from South Wales on London, in which twenty persons were shot dead at Newport. Another organisation, in one sense even more formidable than the chartist, was agitating at the same time for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and was known as the Anti-Corn-Law League. It had already secured the services of two men, Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, who, one by clear reasoning, the other by fervid eloquence, were destined to make a profound impression on all classes of the people.

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S MINISTRY

The new government had, therefore, to deal with a position of almost unexampled difficulty. The people were apparently sinking into deeper poverty and misery year after year. As an outward and visible sign of the inward distress, the state was no longer able to pay its way. It was estimated that the deficit, which had amounted to £1,842,000 in 1840, would reach £2,334,000 in 1841. It is the signal merit of Sir Robert Peel that he terminated this era of private distress and public deficits. He accomplished this task partly by economical administration—for no minister ever valued economy more—and partly by a reform of the financial system, effected in three great budgets. In the budget of 1842 Sir Robert Peel terminated the deficit by reviving the income tax. The proceeds of the tax, which was fixed at 7d. in the £, and was granted in the first instance for three years, were more than sufficient to secure this object. Sir Robert used the surplus to reform the whole customs tariff. The duties on raw materials, he proposed, should never exceed 5 per cent., the duties on partly manufactured articles 12 per cent., and the duties on manufactured articles 20 per cent., of their value. At the same time he reduced the duties on stage-coaches, on foreign and colonial coffee, on foreign and colonial timber, and repealed the export duties on British manufactures.

Other financial measures of great importance were accomplished in Sir Robert Peel's ministry. In 1844 some £250,000,000 of the national debt still bore an interest of 3½ per cent. The improvement in the credit of the country enabled the government to reduce the interest on the stock to 3¼ per cent. for the succeeding ten years, and to 3 per cent. afterwards. This conversion, which effected an immediate saving of £625,000, and an ultimate saving of £1,250,000 a year, was by far the most important measure which had hitherto been applied to the debt; and no operation on the same scale was attempted for more than forty years. In the same year the necessity of renewing the charter of the Bank of England afforded Sir Robert Peel an opportunity of reforming the currency. He separated the issue department

[1841-1845 A.D.]

from the banking department of the bank, and decided that in future it should only be at liberty to issue notes against (1) the debt of £14,000,000 due it from the government, and (2) any bullion actually in its coffers. Few measures of the past century have been the subject of more controversy than this famous act, and at one time its repeated suspension in periods of financial crises seemed to suggest the necessity of its amendment. But opinion on the whole has vindicated its wisdom, and it has survived all the attacks which have been made upon it.

The administration of Sir Robert Peel is also remarkable for its Irish policy. The Irish, under O'Connell, had constantly supported the whig ministry of Lord Melbourne. But their alliance, or understanding, with the whigs had not procured them all the results which they had expected from it. The two great whig measures, dealing with the church and the municipalities, had only been passed after years of controversy, and in a shape which deprived them of many expected advantages. Hence arose a notion in Ireland that nothing was to be expected from a British parliament, and hence began a movement for the repeal of the union which had been accomplished in 1801. This agitation, which smouldered during the reign of the whig ministry, was rapidly revived when Sir Robert Peel entered upon office. The Irish contributed large sums, which were known as repeal rent, to the cause, and they held monster meetings in various parts of Ireland to stimulate the demand for repeal. The ministry met this campaign by coercive legislation regulating the use of arms, by quartering large bodies of troops in Ireland, and by prohibiting a great meeting at Clontarf, the scene of Brian Boru's victory, in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin. They further decided in 1843 to place O'Connell and some of the leading agitators on their trial for conspiracy and sedition. O'Connell was tried before a jury chosen from a defective panel, was convicted on an indictment which contained many counts, and the court passed sentence without distinguishing between these counts. These irregularities induced the house of lords to reverse the judgment, and its reversal did much to prevent mischief. O'Connell's illness, which resulted in his death in 1847, tended also to establish peace. Sir Robert Peel wisely endeavoured to stifle agitation by making considerable concessions to Irish sentiment. He increased the grant which was made to the Roman Catholic college at Maynooth; he established three colleges in the north, south, and west of Ireland for the undenominational education of the middle classes; he appointed a commission—the Devon commission, as it was called, from the name of the nobleman who presided over it—to investigate the conditions on which Irish land was held; and, after the report of the commission, he introduced, though he failed to carry, a measure for remedying some of the grievances of the Irish tenants.^c

The Anti-Corn-Law Agitation

During the whole of 1844 and 1845 the efforts of the Anti-Corn-Law League to keep alive agitation in the country on the subject of the import duties on grain were incessant, and attended with the most important effects. It is true, a great part of the facts to which they had formerly so triumphantly referred, in support of their argument, had now slipped from their grasp. It was now evident that the high prices of grain from 1838 to 1842 had been owing to a succession of bad harvests, and that there was no reason to suppose that in ordinary seasons the nation could not, within its own bounds, supply itself with food. The harvest in this year was not particularly good, and the

importation of wheat was only 313,000 quarters, and yet its price was only 45s. the quarter. But though deprived of the powerful argument for a free importation of grain arising from high prices, the Anti-Corn-Law League found a full compensation for its loss in the general prosperity of the nation, and the embarrassments in which, from low prices, the agricultural interest was involved. Their lecturers and itinerant orators, many of whom were men of great ability, skilfully turned this state of things to their own advantage. They represented the general welfare of the nation, and the high wages of labour, as the result of the application of the principles of free trade to all other interests; the depressed condition of the agriculturists, to the retention of protection on their own. The farmers were everywhere told that the low prices were owing to the Corn Laws, and could only be obviated by their removal. So far was the movement carried that Mr. Cobden, towards the close of the session, himself moved for a committee to inquire into the causes of agricultural distress, which was only defeated by a majority of 92 in a house of 334. It was distinctly proved by the conservative members from every part of England, that the distress among the farmers from low prices was not light and partial, but general and severe—a state of things which the more reflecting among them ascribed to Sir Robert Peel's new sliding-scale affording no adequate protection to rural industry.

So general had distress now become among the agricultural interests that Mr. Cobden said in his opening speech on this debate, that one half of the farmers in England were in a state of insolvency, and the other half paying their rents out of their capital—assertions which were not contradicted from either side of the house. A few nights after his motion had been disposed of, Mr. Miles, a protectionist, moved that the surplus of the revenue should be applied to the relief of the agricultural interest, now, beyond all question, the most suffering in the community. The motion was negatived by a majority of 213 to 78; but in the course of the debate some observations fell from both sides, which showed not obscurely the changes which were approaching. Towards the close of the session nothing else was debated in the house of commons but the Corn Laws; and the declining majority for protection showed that the waverers were beginning to seek their own advantage in anticipating what they saw was to become ere long the measures of government. The session closed on the 9th August with a queen's speech, in which her majesty declared the "cordial assent" she had given "to the bills presented for remitting the duties on many articles of import."

In truth, the state of the country, induced by the previous policy of government, and the long adoption of the cheapening system, had rendered the extension of the principles of free trade to the commerce of grain a matter of necessity. Prices of all the articles of commerce and production having been reduced fully 50 per cent. by the monetary system, and at least 15 per cent. more by the reduced tariff, it had become impossible to maintain a system of heavy duties on the import of grain. When the prices of all articles of produce—that is, the remuneration of every species of industry—had been lowered above 60 per cent. by the measures of the legislature, it became indispensable to lower, in some degree at least, the cost of the food on which the working classes were to subsist. The protectionists were quite right in imputing the repeal of the Corn Laws to Sir Robert Peel, but they erred in their opinion as to the time and the measure which induced the necessity that led to that repeal. It was in 1819 that the policy was inaugurated, which could not fail in the end to remove all restrictions on the import of grain; it was by unanimous votes of the house of commons, including the whole pro-

[1845 A.D.]

tectionists themselves, upholding the monetary system, that free trade was in reality established as the policy of the country. When Sir Robert Peel introduced his tariff in 1842, so materially lowering the import duties, he only yielded to the necessity which he had introduced and parliament had so unanimously approved. In proposing to the legislature the entire repeal of the Corn Laws, he did not adopt a new policy; he only gave way to the necessary consequences of their own acts.

Finally, in 1845, Sir Robert Peel having received the reports from Ireland, which were extremely alarming, brought before the cabinet the question, What was to be done to avert the threatened calamity? His own idea was to throw the ports at once open by an order in council, trusting to parliament for a bill of indemnity. But his colleagues were divided on the necessity of such an extreme measure, and after several cabinet councils had been held in the beginning of November, it was agreed to appoint a commission to inquire into and suggest measures to avert extreme distress in Ireland, and the cabinet met on the 25th to consider the reports received. It was found, however, that the former division remained: a minority of the cabinet, at the head of which was Lord Stanley, deemed the circumstances not yet such as to justify any permanent deviation from the protective policy of government. Sir Robert Peel thought otherwise: he was so strongly impressed with the dangers of the approaching crisis that he deemed it indispensable to make not only a temporary but a permanent change of policy. As the cabinet was divided on this subject, however, and Lord John Russell, by his letter from Edinburgh, already quoted, had declared for total repeal of the import duties, and put himself at the head of the free-trade party, he felt the impossibility at such a crisis of carrying on the government in the face of such a coalition, and he accordingly tendered his resignation and that of his colleagues to her majesty, which was accepted.

The queen immediately sent for Lord John Russell, and he received the royal command on the 8th of December, and reached Osborne House, in the Isle of Wight, on the 11th. His answer to her majesty, when requested to undertake the formation of a ministry, was, that as the party to which he belonged was in a minority in the house of commons, it would be vain for him to attempt a task which would expose her majesty, ere long, to the inconvenience arising from a second change of servants. He recommended the queen, accordingly, to send for Lord Stanley, to endeavour to form a protective ministry; but that nobleman, upon being applied to, declared his absolute inability to do so. "I informed her majesty," says Peel,^a "that, considering that Lord Stanley, and such of my colleagues as had differed from me, had positively declined to undertake the formation of a government, and that Lord John Russell having had the concurrence and support of all his political friends, with a single exception, had abandoned the attempt to form one, I should feel it my duty, if required by her majesty, to resume office." Upon this the queen renewed her application to Lord John, and showed him a paper which Sir Robert Peel had left with her when he resigned office, in which he declared his intention, "in his private capacity, to give every support to the new minister whom her majesty might select to effect a settlement of the question of the Corn Laws." This entirely altered the case, as it assured the whig cabinet of the support of at least one, and that the most powerful, of the great tory party. Lord John accordingly returned to town, to consult his friends on the possibility of forming a cabinet, and at first there was every prospect of success. But ere long a difficulty, which proved insurmountable, presented itself. Earl Grey, upon being applied to, refused to join the new

[1845-1846 A.D.]

cabinet if Lord Palmerston formed part of it—so strongly was he impressed with the hazard attending the foreign policy to which the latter noble lord was attached. Lord Palmerston, however, from his ability, and vast diplomatic information and connections, was too powerful a man to be dispensed with. The result was, that this attempt to form a cabinet failed, and Peel was informed that nothing remained but for him to resume office. This he accordingly did, and the whole cabinet resumed their places, with the exception of Lord Stanley, who retired. He was succeeded by Mr. Gladstone as colonial secretary; and the duke of Buccleuch, who at this crisis joined the free-trade party in the cabinet, was made president of the council in room of Lord Wharncliffe, who had died on the 19th. The cabinet was now entirely composed of free-traders.

Free Trade (1846 A.D.)

This sudden resignation, and still more sudden reconstruction of Sir Robert Peel's cabinet, left no doubt as to some great change in the Corn Laws being in contemplation; and it was soon whispered that the cabinet was now unanimous, and that the "Iron Duke" himself had reluctantly given in. Before parliament met, on the 19th of January, it was generally understood that the cause of protection was lost, and the question was set at rest, so far as the cabinet was concerned, by the paragraph in the queen's speech on the subject, delivered by her majesty in person.

"I have to lament," said her majesty, "that, in consequence of a failure of the potato crop in several parts of the United Kingdom, there will be a deficient supply of an article of food which forms the chief subsistence of great numbers of my people. The disease by which the plant has been affected has prevailed to the utmost extent in Ireland. I have adopted all such measures as were in my power for the purpose of alleviating the sufferings which may be caused by this calamity, and I confidently rely on your co-operation in devising such other means for effecting the same benevolent purpose as may require the sanction of the legislature. I have had great satisfaction in giving my assent to the measures which you have presented to me from time to time, calculated to extend commerce, and to stimulate domestic skill and industry, by the repeal of prohibitory and the relaxation of protective duties. The prosperous state of the revenue, the increased demand for labour, and the general improvement which has taken place in the internal condition of the country, are strong testimonies in favour of the course which you have pursued. I recommend you to take into your earnest consideration, whether the principles on which you have acted may not be yet more extensively applied, and whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties upon many articles the produce or manufacture of other countries, to make such further reductions and remissions as may tend to insure the continuance of the great benefits to which I have adverted, and, by enlarging our commercial intercourse, to strengthen the bonds of amity with foreign powers."

Such were the words by which Sir Robert Peel, in her majesty's name, announced to the world the greatest change ever made in the commercial policy of any nation, namely, the sudden transition from a protective policy, the natural safeguard of a rising, to a free-trade, the invariable demand of an advanced, stage of civilisation. His detailed plans were brought forward in a luminous speech of four hours' duration, the object of which was to represent the change in the Corn Laws, great as it was, as not an insulated measure,

[1846 A.D.]

but part of a great system of policy by which all classes were to be ultimately benefited.

The public excitement was extreme.^b Peel was instantly and furiously denounced as a traitor by those with whom he had been in close political union all his life; though men of ordinary discernment must have perceived whither he had been tending, and that the stress of events rendered the step inevitable. John Wilson Croker solemnly warned him that he was breaking up the old interests, and forcing on exactly such a catastrophe as did the Noailles and the Montmorencies in France, in 1789.

Disraeli, in particular, attacked Peel with a ferocity and malignity unparalleled since the days of Walpole. It is shocking to read in the *Parliamentary Debates* the vituperation, the calumnies, the insults, and the gross personal epithets hurled at him night after night by Disraeli, whose conduct is aggravated by the fact which afterwards came to light, that Peel, who was too high-minded to reveal it, had in his possession at the time a written request from his adversary for an office. Disraeli's whole career, though marking him out as a strategist of consummate genius, and a controversial gladiator of unrivalled skill and unscrupulousness, both in attack and in defence, was that of a political adventurer; from the time when he posed as an ultra-radical candidate for Wycombe, in 1832, speedily followed by his recantation four years later in the diatribes known as the *Runnymede Letters* in *The Times*, down to his death in 1881 in the odour of tory sanctity. He was always regarded as the necessary, but feared and mistrusted leader of the party, which he boasted of having educated up to the abandonment of its principles for the sake of office. What he falsely charged upon Peel, was done repeatedly by himself, in an aggravated form. The action of the tories in detaching themselves from Peel placed them in antagonism to the people and to the spirit of the time, and was a main cause of their exclusion from office for nearly a generation.

The government proposal was carried June 25th, 1846, after many nights of heated and acrimonious debate. The league instantly dissolved its formidable organisation. The tory thirst for revenge upon Peel was not long delayed. Under the titular leadership of Lord George Bentinck, who suddenly abjured the race-course and the betting-ring for the purpose, but under the actual inspiration of Disraeli, they joined forces with the whigs and with Daniel O'Connell's followers, and defeated the great minister on the second reading of a bill for the better protection of life in Ireland. Not that they objected to the measure; for they supported it at the outset and they adopted it subsequently; but they were determined to hound him from office, for an opposite reason to that which decreed the exile of Coriolanus from Rome. He foresaw the result, and did not shrink from his course. In his closing speech, one of the most magnanimous, as well as one of the most powerful and effective, ever heard within the walls of parliament, he bore testimony to the disinterestedness, the energy, and the simple yet unadorned eloquence of Richard Cobden, and declared that his name would ever be associated with the success of the measure. In the same speech he uttered the pathetic words about his own name being remembered with good-will in lowly homes when the inmates recruited their strength "with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because no longer leavened by a sense of injustice." Posterity has done honour to his memory, and to his patriotic endeavours "to scatter plenty o'er a smiling land."^c

There is no doubt that Peel's efforts were followed by a remarkable development of British trade. In the twenty-seven years from 1815 to 1842 the

[1846-1849 A.D.]

export trade of Great Britain diminished from £49,600,000 to £47,280,000; while in the twenty-seven years which succeeded 1842 it increased from £47,280,000 to nearly £190,000,000. These figures are a simple and enduring monument to the minister's memory. It is fair to add that the whole increase was not due to free trade. It was partly attributable to the remarkable development of communications which marked this period.

LORD RUSSELL'S MINISTRY

On Sir Robert Peel's resignation the queen again sent for Lord John Russell. The difficulties which had prevented his forming a ministry in the previous year were satisfactorily arranged, and Lord Palmerston accepted the seals of the foreign office, while Lord Grey was sent to the colonial office. The history of the succeeding years was destined, however, to prove that Lord Grey had had solid reasons for objecting to Lord Palmerston's return to his old post; for, whatever judgment may ultimately be formed on Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, there can be little doubt that it did not tend to the maintenance of peace. The first occasion on which danger was threatened arose immediately after the installation of the new ministry on the question of the Spanish marriages. The queen of Spain, Isabella, was a little girl still in her teens; the heir to the throne was her younger sister, the infanta Fernanda. Diplomacy had long been occupied with the marriages of these children; and Lord Aberdeen had virtually accepted the principle, which the French government had laid down, that a husband for the queen should be found among the descendants of Philip V, and that her sister's marriage to the duc de Montpensier—a son of Louis Philippe—should not be celebrated till the queen was married and had issue. While agreeing to this compromise, Lord Aberdeen declared that he regarded the Spanish marriages as a Spanish and not as a European question, and that, if it proved impossible to find a suitable consort for the queen among the descendants of Philip V, Spain must be free to choose a prince for her throne elsewhere. The available descendants of Philip V were the two sons of Don Francis, the younger brother of Don Carlos, and of these the French government was in favor of the elder, while the British government preferred the younger brother. Lord Palmerston strongly objected to the prince whom the French government supported; and, almost immediately after acceding to office, he wrote a despatch in which he enumerated the various candidates for the queen of Spain's hand, including Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, a near relation of the prince consort, among the number. Louis Philippe regarded this despatch as a departure from the principle on which he had agreed with Lord Aberdeen, and at once hurried on the simultaneous marriages of the queen with the French candidate, and of her sister with the duc de Montpensier. His action broke up the *entente cordiale* which had been established between M. Guizot and Lord Aberdeen.

The second occasion on which Lord Palmerston's vigorous diplomacy excited alarm arose out of the revolution which broke out almost universally in Europe in 1848. A rising in Hungary was suppressed by Austria with Russian assistance, and, after its suppression many leading Hungarians took refuge in Turkish territory. Austria and Russia addressed demands to the Porte for their surrender. Lord Palmerston determined to support the Porte in its refusal to give up these exiles, and actually sent the British fleet to the Dardanelles with this object. His success raised the credit of Great Britain and his own reputation. The presence of the British fleet, however, at the

[1840-1851 A.D.]

Dardanelles suggested to him the possibility of settling another long-standing controversy. For years British subjects settled in Greece had raised complaints against the Greek government. In particular, Don Pacifico, a Jew, but a native of Gibraltar, complained that at a riot in which his house had been attacked, he had lost jewels, furniture, and papers which he alleged to be worth more than £30,000. As Lord Palmerston was unable by correspondence to induce the Greek government to settle claims of this character, he determined to enforce them; and by his orders a large number of Greek vessels were seized and detained by the British fleet. The French government tendered its good offices to compose the dispute, and an arrangement was actually arrived at between Lord Palmerston and the French minister in London. Unfortunately, before its terms reached Greece the British minister at Athens had ordered the resumption of hostilities, and had compelled the Greek government to submit to more humiliating conditions. News of this settlement excited the strongest feelings both in Paris and London. In Paris, Prince Louis Napoleon, who had acceded to the presidency of the French republic, decided on recalling his representative from the British court. In London the lords passed a vote of censure on Lord Palmerston's proceedings; and the commons only sustained the minister by adopting a resolution approving in general terms the principles on which the foreign policy of the country had been conducted.

In pursuing the vigorous policy which characterised his tenure of the foreign office, Lord Palmerston frequently omitted to consult his colleagues in the cabinet, the prime minister, or the queen. In the course of 1849 her majesty formally complained to Lord John Russell that important despatches were sent off without her knowledge; and an arrangement was made under which Lord Palmerston undertook to submit every despatch to the queen through the prime minister. In 1850, after the Don Pacifico debate, the queen repeated these commands in a much stronger memorandum. But Lord Palmerston, though all confidence between himself and the court was destroyed, continued in office. In the autumn of 1851 the *coup d'état* in Paris led to another dispute. The cabinet decided to do nothing that could wear the appearance of interference in the internal affairs of France; but Lord Palmerston, in conversation with the French minister in London, took upon himself to approve the bold and decisive step taken by the president. The ministry naturally refused to tolerate this conduct, and Lord Palmerston was summarily removed from his office.

Irish Famine; Rebellion of 1848

The removal of Lord Palmerston led almost directly to the fall of the whig government. Before relating, however, the exact occurrences which produced its defeat, it is necessary to retrace our steps and describe the policy which it had pursued in internal matters during the six years in which it had been in power. Throughout that period the Irish famine had been its chief anxiety and difficulty. Sir Robert Peel had attempted to deal with it (1) by purchasing large quantities of Indian corn, which he had retailed at low prices in Ireland, and (2) by enabling the grand juries to employ the people on public works, which were to be paid out of moneys advanced by the state, one-half being ultimately repayable by the locality. These measures were not entirely successful. It was found, in practice, that the sale of Indian corn at low prices by the government checked the efforts of private individuals to supply food; and that the offer of comparatively easy

[1846-1849 A.D.]

work to the poor at the cost of the public prevented their seeking harder private work either in Ireland or in Great Britain. The new government, with this experience before it, decided on trusting to private enterprise to supply the necessary food, and on throwing the whole cost of the works, which the locality might undertake, on local funds. If the famine had been less severe, this policy might possibly have succeeded. Universal want, however, paralysed every one. The people, destitute of other means of livelihood, crowded to the relief works. In the beginning of 1847 nearly seven hundred and fifty thousand persons—or nearly one person out of every ten in Ireland—were so employed. With such vast multitudes to relieve,



it proved impracticable to exact the labour which was required as a test of destitution. The roads, which it was decided to make, were blocked by the labourers employed upon them, and by the stones, which the labourers were supposed to crush for their repair. In the presence of this difficulty the government decided, early in 1847, gradually to discontinue the relief works, and to substitute for them relief committees charged with the task of feeding the people. At one time no less than three million persons—more than one-third of the entire population of Ireland—were supported by these committees. At the same time it decided on adopting

two measures of a more permanent character. The Poor Law of 1838 had made no provision for the relief of the poor outside the workhouse, and outdoor relief was sanctioned by an act of 1847. Irish landlords complained that their properties, ruined by the famine, and encumbered by the extravagances of their predecessors, could not bear the cost of this new Poor Law, and the ministry introduced and carried a measure enabling the embarrassed owners of life estates to sell their property and discharge their liabilities. It is the constant misfortune of Ireland that the measures intended for her relief aggravate her distress. The Encumbered Estates Act, though it substituted a solvent for an insolvent proprietary, placed the Irish tenants at the mercy of landlords of whom they had no previous knowledge, who were frequently absentees, who bought the land as a matter of business, and who dealt with it on business principles, by raising the rent. The new Poor Law, by throwing the maintenance of the poor on the soil, encouraged landlords to extricate themselves from their responsibilities by evicting their tenants.

Famine, mortality, and emigration left their mark on Ireland. In four years, from 1845 to 1849, its population decreased from 8,295,000 to 7,256,000, or by more than a million persons; and the decline which took place at that time went on to the end of the century. The population of Ireland in 1901

[1847-1848 A.D.]

had decreased to 4,457,000 souls. This fact is the more remarkable, because Ireland is almost the only portion of the British Empire, or indeed of the civilised world, where such a circumstance has occurred. We must go to countries like the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, devastated by Ottoman rule, to find such a diminution in the numbers of the people as was seen in Ireland during the last half of the nineteenth century. It was probably inevitable that the distress of Ireland should have been followed by a renewal of Irish outrages. A terrible series of agrarian crimes was committed in the autumn of 1847; and the ministry felt compelled, in consequence, to strengthen its hands by a new measure of coercion, and by suspending the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland. The latter measure at once brought to a crisis the so-called rebellion of 1848, for his share in which Mr. Smith O'Brien, an Irish member of parliament, was convicted of high treason. The government, however, did not venture to carry out the grim sentence which the law still applied to traitors, and introduced an act enabling it to commute the death penalty to transportation. The "insurrection" had from the first proved abortive. With Mr. Smith O'Brien's transportation it practically terminated.

Commercial Crisis; Chartism

In the mean while the difficulties which the government was experiencing from the Irish famine had been aggravated by a grave commercial crisis in England. In the autumn of 1847 a series of failures in the great commercial centres created a panic in the city of London, which forced consols down to 78, and induced the government to take upon itself the responsibility of suspending the Bank Charter Act. That step, enabling the directors of the Bank of England to issue notes unsecured by bullion, had the effect of gradually restoring confidence. But a grave commercial crisis of this character is often attended with other than financial consequences. The stringency of the money market increases the distress of the industrial classes by diminishing the demand for work; and when labour suffers, political agitation flourishes. Early in 1848, moreover, revolutions on the Continent produced a natural craving for changes at home. Louis Philippe was driven out of Paris, the emperor of Austria was driven out of Vienna, the Austrian soldiery had to withdraw from Milan, and even in Berlin the crown had to make terms with the people.

While thrones were falling or tottering in every country in Europe, it was inevitable that excitement and agitation should prevail in Great Britain. The chartists reviving the machinery which they had endeavoured to employ in 1839, decided on preparing a monster petition to parliament, which was to be escorted to Westminster by a monster procession. Their preparations excited general alarm, and on the invitation of the government no less than 170,000 special constables were sworn in to protect life and property against a rabble. By the judicious arrangements, however, which were made by the duke of Wellington, the peace of the metropolis was secured. The chartists were induced to abandon the procession which had caused so much alarm, and the monster petition was carried in a cab to the house of commons. There it was mercilessly picked to pieces by a select committee. It was found that, instead of containing nearly 6,000,000 signatures, as its originators had boasted, less than 2,000,000 names were attached to it. Some of the names, moreover, were obviously fictitious or even absurd. The exposure of these facts turned the whole thing into ridicule, and gave parliament an excuse for postponing measures of organic reform which might otherwise have been brought forward.

Navigation Acts; Ten Hours Bill

If the ministry thus abstained from pressing forward a large scheme of political reform, it succeeded in carrying two measures of the highest commercial and social importance. In 1849 it supplemented the free-trade policy, which Sir Robert Peel had developed, by the repeal of the Navigation Acts. Briefly stated, these acts, which had been originated during the protectorate of Cromwell, and continued after the restoration, reserved the whole coasting trade of the country for British vessels and British seamen, and much of the foreign trade for British vessels, commanded and chiefly manned by British subjects. The acts, therefore, were in the strictest sense protective, but they were also designed to increase the strength of Great Britain at sea, by maintaining large numbers of British seamen. They had been defended by Adam Smith on the ground that defence was "of much more importance than opulence," and by the same reasoning they had been described by John Stuart Mill as "though economically disadvantageous, politically expedient." The acts, however, threw a grave burden on British trade and British shipowners. Their provisions by restricting competition naturally tended to raise freights; and by restricting employment made it difficult for shipowners to man their vessels. Accordingly the government wisely determined on their repeal; and one of the last and greatest battles between free trade and protection was fought over the question. The second reading of the government bill was carried in the house of lords by a majority of only ten; it would not have been carried at all if the government had not secured a much larger number of proxies than their opponents could obtain.

If the repeal of the Navigation Acts constituted a measure of the highest commercial importance, the passage of the Ten Hours Bill in 1847 marked the first great advance in factory legislation. Something, indeed, had already been done to remedy the evils arising from the employment of women and very young children in factories and mines. In 1833 Lord Ashley, better known as Lord Shaftesbury, had carried the first important factory act. In 1842 he had succeeded, with the help of the striking report of a royal commission, in inducing parliament to prohibit the employment of women and of boys under ten years of age in mines. And in 1843 Sir James Graham, who was home secretary in Sir Robert Peel's administration, had been compelled by the pressure of public opinion to introduce a measure providing for the education of children employed in factories, and for limiting the hours of work of children and young persons. The educational clauses of this bill were obviously framed in the interests of the Church of England, and raised a heated controversy which led to the abandonment of the measure; and in the following year Sir James Graham introduced a new bill dealing with the labour question alone. Briefly stated, his proposal was that no child under nine years of age should be employed in a factory, and that no young person under eighteen should be employed for more than twelve hours a day. This measure gave rise to the famous controversy on the ten-hours clause, which commenced in 1844 and was protracted till 1847. Lord Ashley and the factory reformers contended, on the one hand, that ten hours were long enough for any person to work; their opponents maintained, on the contrary, that the adoption of the clause would injure the working-classes by lowering the rate of wages, and ruin the manufacturers by exposing them to foreign competition. In 1847 the reform was at last adopted. It is a remarkable fact that it was carried against the views of the leading statesmen on both sides of the house. It was the triumph of common sense over official arguments.

[1850 A.D.]

Death of Peel; the Oxford Movement

During the first four years of Lord John Russell's government his administration had never enjoyed any very large measure of popular support, but it had been partly sustained by the advocacy of Sir Robert Peel. The differences which estranged Sir Robert from his old supporters were far greater than those which separated him from the whigs, and the latter were therefore constantly able to rely on his assistance. In the summer of 1850, however, a lamentable accident—a fall from his horse—deprived the country of the services of its great statesman. His death naturally affected the position of parties. The small remnant of able men, indeed, who had been associated with him in his famous administrations still maintained an attitude of neutrality. But the bulk of the conservative party rallied under the lead of Lord Stanley (afterwards Derby) in the house of lords, and gradually submitted to, rather than accepted, the lead of Mr., Disraeli in the house of commons.

In the autumn which succeeded Sir Robert Peel's death, an event which had not been foreseen agitated the country and produced a crisis. During the years which had succeeded the Reform Bill a great religious movement had influenced politics both in England and Scotland. In England a body of eminent men at Oxford—of whom Mr., afterwards Cardinal, Newman was the chief, but who numbered among their leaders Mr. Hurrell Froude, the brother of the historian, and Mr. Keble, the author of the *Christian Year*—endeavoured to prove that the doctrines of the Church of England were identical with those of the primitive Catholic church, and that every Catholic doctrine might be held by those who were within its pale. This view was explained in a remarkable series of tracts, which gave their authors the name of Tractarians. The most famous of these, and the last of the series, *Tract XC*, was published three years after the queen's accession to the throne. In Scotland, the Presbyterian church—mainly under the guidance of Dr. Chalmers, one of the most eloquent preachers of the century—was simultaneously engaged in a contest with the state on the subject of ecclesiastical patronage. Both movements had this in common, that they indicated a revival of religious energy, and aimed at vindicating the authority of the church and resisting the interference of the state in church matters. The Scottish movement led to the disruption of the Church of Scotland and the formation of the Free Church in 1843. The Tractarian movement was ultimately terminated by the secession of Newman and many of his associates from the Church of England, and their admission to the church of Rome. These secessions raised a feeling of alarm throughout England. The people, thoroughly Protestant, were excited by the proofs—which they thought were afforded—that the real object of the Tractarians was to reconcile England with Rome; and practices which are now regarded as venial or even praiseworthy—such as the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit, and the institution of the weekly offertory—were denounced because they were instituted by the tractarians, and were regarded as insidious devices to lead the country Romewards.

The sympathies of the whigs, and especially of the whig prime minister, Lord John Russell, were with the people; and Lord John displayed his dislike to the Romanising tendencies of the Tractarians by appointing Mr. Hampden—whose views had been formally condemned by the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford—to the bishopric of Hereford. The high-church party endeavoured to oppose the appointment at every stage; but their attempts exposed them to a serious defeat. The courts held that, though the appointment of a

bishop by the crown required confirmation in the archbishop's court, the confirmation was a purely ministerial act which could not be refused. The effort which the high-church party had made to resist Dr. Hampden's appointment had thus resulted in showing conclusively that authority resided in the crown and not in the archbishop.

French Scare

The circumstances which directly led to the defeat of the whigs were, in one sense, a consequence of the revolutionary wave which had swept over Europe in 1848. The fall of Louis Philippe in that year created a panic in Great Britain. Men thought that the unsettled state of France made war probable, and they were alarmed at the defenceless condition of England. Lord Palmerston, speaking in 1845, had declared that "steam had bridged the Channel"; and the duke of Wellington had addressed a letter to Sir John Burgoyne, in which he had demonstrated that the country was not in a position to resist an invading force. The panic was so great that the ministry felt it necessary to make exceptional provisions for allaying it. Lord John Russell decided on asking parliament to sanction increased armaments, and to raise the income tax to 1s. in the pound in order to pay for them. The occasion deserves to be recollected as the last on which a prime minister, who was not also chancellor of the exchequer, has himself proposed the budget of the year. But it was still more memorable because the remedy which Lord John proposed at once destroyed the panic which had suggested it. A certain increase of the income tax to a shilling seemed a much more serious calamity than the uncertain prospect of a possible invasion. The estimates were recast, the budget was withdrawn, and the nation was content to dispense with any addition to its military and naval strength. Events in France, in the mean while, moved with railway speed. Louis Napoleon became president of the French Republic: in 1851 he became emperor of the French. The new emperor, indeed, took pains to reassure a troubled Continent that "the empire was peace." The people insisted on believing—and, as the event proved, rightly—that the empire was war. Notwithstanding the success of the great exhibition of 1851, which was supposed to inaugurate a new reign of peace, the panic, which had been temporarily allayed in 1848, revived at the close of 1851, and the government endeavoured to allay it by reconstituting the militia. There were two possible expedients. An act of 1757 had placed a militia, composed of men selected in each parish by ballot, under the direct authority of the crown, liable to be called out for active service, and to be placed under military law. But the act had been supplemented by a series of statutes passed between 1808 and 1812, which had provided a local militia, raised, like the regular militia, by ballot, but, unlike the latter, only liable for service for the suppression of riots, or in the event of imminent invasion. Lord John Russell's government, forced to do something by the state of public opinion, but anxious—from the experience of 1848—to make that something moderate, decided on reviving the local militia. Lord Palmerston at once suggested that the regular and not the local militia should be revived; and, in a small house of only 265 members, he succeeded in carrying a resolution to that effect. He had, in this way, what he called his "tit for tat" with Lord John; and the queen, accepting her minister's resignation, sent for Lord Derby—for Lord Stanley had now succeeded to the title—and charged him with the task of forming a ministry.

[1852 A.D.]

LORD DERBY'S MINISTRY (1852 A.D.)

The government which Lord Derby succeeded in forming was composed almost exclusively of the men who had rebelled against Sir Robert Peel in 1845. It was led in the house of commons by the brilliant but somewhat unscrupulous statesman who had headed the revolt. With the exception of Lord Derby and one other man, its members had no experience of high office; and it had no chance of commanding a majority of the house of commons in the existing parliament. It owed its position to the divisions of its opponents. Profiting by their experience, it succeeded in framing and passing a measure reconstituting the regular militia, which obtained general approval. It is perhaps worth observing that it maintained the machinery of a ballot, but reserved it only in case experience should prove that it was necessary. Voluntary enlistment under the new militia bill was to be the rule: compulsory service was only to be resorted to if voluntary enlistment should fail. This success, to a certain extent, strengthened the position of the new ministry. It was obvious, however, that its stability would ultimately be determined by its financial policy. Composed of the men who had resisted the free trade measures of the previous decade, its fate depended on its attitude towards free trade. In forming his administration Lord Derby had found it necessary to declare that, though he was still in favour of a tax on corn, he should take no steps in this direction till the country had received an opportunity of expressing its opinion. His leader in the house of commons went much further, and declared that the time had gone by for recurring to protection. The view which Mr. Disraeli thus propounded in defiance of his previous opinions was confirmed by the electors on the dissolution of parliament. Though the new government obtained some increased strength from the result of the polls, the country, it was evident, had no intention of abandoning the policy of free trade, which by this time, it was clear, had conferred substantial benefits on all classes.

When the new parliament met in the autumn of 1852 it was at once plain that the issue would be determined on the rival merits of the old and the new financial systems. Mr. Disraeli courted the decision by at once bringing forward the budget, which custom, and perhaps convenience, would have justified him in postponing till the following spring. His proposal—in which he avowedly threw over his friends on the ground that “he had greater subjects to consider than the triumph of obsolete opinions”—was, in effect, an attempt to conciliate his old supporters by a policy of doles, and to find the means for doing so by the increased taxation of the middle classes. He offered to relieve the shipping interest by transferring some of the cost of lighting the coasts to the consolidated fund; the West India interest by sanctioning the refining of sugar in bond; and the landed classes by reducing the malt tax by one half, and by repealing the old war duty on hops. He suggested that the cost of these measures should be defrayed by extending the income tax to Ireland, to industrial incomes of £100 and to permanent incomes of £50 a year, as well as by doubling the house tax, and extending it to all £10 householders. The weight, therefore, of these measures was either purposely or unintentionally thrown mainly on persons living in houses worth from £10 to £20 a year, or on persons in receipt of incomes from £50 to £150 a year. This defect in the budget was exposed in a great speech by Gladstone, which did much to insure the defeat of the scheme and the fall of the ministry.

THE ABERDEEN MINISTRY

On the resignation of Lord Derby, the queen, anxious to terminate a period of weak governments, decided on endeavouring to combine in one cabinet the chiefs of the whig party and the followers of Sir Robert Peel. With this view she sent both for Lord Aberdeen, who had held the foreign office under Sir Robert, and for Lord Lansdowne, who was the Nestor of the whigs; and with Lord Lansdowne's concurrence charged Lord Aberdeen with the task of forming a government. In the new ministry Lord Aberdeen became first lord of the treasury, Gladstone chancellor of the exchequer, Lord John Russell foreign minister—though he was almost immediately replaced in the foreign office by Lord Clarendon, and assumed himself the presidency of the council. Lord Palmerston went to the home office. One other appointment must also be mentioned. The secretary of state for the colonies was also at that time secretary of state for war. No one in 1852, however, regarded that office as of material importance, and it was intrusted by Lord Aberdeen to an amiable and conscientious nobleman, the duke of Newcastle.

The first session of the Aberdeen administration will be chiefly recollected for the remarkable budget which Gladstone brought forward. It constituted a worthy supplement to the measures of 1842, 1845, and 1846. Gladstone swept away the duty on one great necessary of life—soap; he repealed the duties on 123 other articles; he reduced the duties on 133 others, among them on tea; and he found means for paying for these reforms and for the gradual reduction and ultimate abolition of the income tax, which had become very unpopular, by (1) extending the tax to incomes of £100 a year; (2) an increase of the spirit duties; and (3) applying the death duties to real property, and to property passing by settlement. There can be little doubt that this great proposal was one of the most striking which had ever been brought forward in the house of commons; there can also, unhappily, be no doubt that its promises and intentions were frustrated by events which proved too strong for its author. For Gladstone, in framing his budget, had contemplated a continuance of peace, and the country was, unhappily, already drifting into war.

The Holy Places

For some years an obscure quarrel had been conducted at Constantinople about the custody of the Holy Places at Jerusalem. France, relying on a treaty concluded in the first half of the eighteenth century, claimed the guardianship of these places for the Latin church. But the rights which the Latin church had thus obtained had practically fallen into disuse, while the Greek branch of the Christian church had occupied and repaired the shrines which the Latins had neglected. In the years which preceded 1853, however, France had shown more activity in asserting her claims; and the new emperor of the French, anxious to conciliate the church which had supported his elevation to the throne, had a keen interest in upholding them. If, for reasons of policy, the emperor had grounds for his action, he had personal motives for thwarting the czar of Russia; for the latter potentate had been foolish enough, in recognising the second empire, to address its sovereign as "*Mon Cher Ami*," instead of, in the customary language of sovereigns, as "*Monsieur Mon Frère*." Thus at the close of 1852, and in the beginning of 1853, Russia and France were both addressing opposite and irreconcilable demands to

[1853 A.D.]

the Porte, and France was already talking of sending her fleet to the Dardanelles, while Russia was placing a *corps d'armée* on active service and despatching Prince Menshikov on a special mission to Constantinople. So far the quarrel which had occurred at the Porte was obviously one in which Great Britain had no concern. The Aberdeen ministry, however, thought it desirable that it should be represented in the crisis by a strong man at Constantinople; and it selected Lord Stratford de Redcliffe for the post, which he had filled in former years with marked ability. Lord Stratford soon discovered that Prince Menshikov was the bearer of larger demands, and that he was requiring the Porte to agree to a treaty acknowledging the right of Russia to protect the Greek church throughout the Turkish dominions. By Lord Stratford's advice the Porte—while making the requisite concession respecting the holy places—refused to grant the new demand; and Prince Menshikov thereupon withdrew from Constantinople.

The rejection of Prince Menshikov's ultimatum was followed by momentous consequences. Russia—or rather her czar—resolved on the occupation of the principalities; the British ministry—though the quarrel did not directly concern Great Britain—sent a fleet to the Dardanelles and placed it under Lord Stratford's orders. Diplomacy, however, made a fresh attempt to terminate the dispute, and in July, 1853, a note was agreed upon by the four neutral powers, France, Great Britain, Austria, and Prussia, which it was decided to present to Constantinople and St. Petersburg. This note, the adoption of which would have insured peace, was accepted at St. Petersburg; at Constantinople it was, unfortunately, rejected, mainly on Lord Stratford's advice, and in opposition to his instructions from home. Instead, however, of insisting on the adoption of the note to which it had agreed, Lord Aberdeen's ministry recommended the czar to accept some amendments to it suggested by Lord Stratford, which it was disposed to regard as unimportant. It then discovered, however, that the czar attached a different meaning to the original note than it had itself applied to it, and in conjunction with France it thereupon ceased to recommend the Vienna note—as it was called—for acceptance. This decision separated the two western powers from Austria and Prussia, who were disposed to think that Russia had done all that could have been required of her in accepting the note which the four powers had agreed upon.

The Crimean War

In October the Porte, encouraged by the presence of the British fleet in the Bosphorus, took the bold step of summoning the Russians to evacuate the principalities. Following up this demand the Turkish troops attacked the Russian army, and inflicted on it one or two sharp defeats. The Russians retaliated by loosing their squadron from Sebastopol, and on the 30th of November it attacked and destroyed the Turkish fleet at Sinope. The massacre of Sinope—as it was rather inaccurately called in Great Britain, for it is difficult to deny that it was a legitimate act of a belligerent power—created an almost irresistible demand for war among the British people. Yielding to popular opinion, the British ministry assented to a suggestion of the French emperor that the fleets of the allied powers should enter the Black Sea and “invite” every Russian vessel to return to Sebastopol. The decision was taken at an unfortunate hour. Diplomats, pursuing their labours at Vienna, had succeeded in drawing up a fresh note which they thought might prove acceptable both at St. Petersburg and at Constantinople. Presented almost

[1854-1855 A.D.]

at the moment at which the czar learned that the French and British fleets had entered the Black Sea, the Russian government, instead of considering it, withdrew its ministers from London and Paris; the French and British ambassadors were thereupon withdrawn from St. Petersburg. An ultimatum was soon afterwards addressed to Russia requiring her to evacuate the principalities, and war began. In deciding on war the British government relied on the capacity of its fleet, which was intrusted to the command of Sir Charles Napier, to strike a great blow in the Baltic. The fleet was despatched with extraordinary rejoicings, and amidst loud and confident expressions of its certain triumph. As a matter of fact, it did very little. In the south of Europe, however, the Turkish armies on the Danube, strengthened by the advice of British officers, were more successful. The Russians were forced to retire, and the principalities were evacuated.

A prudent administration might possibly have succeeded in stopping the war at this point. But the temper of the country was by this time excited, and it was loudly demanding something more than a preliminary success. It was resolved to invade the Crimea and attack the great arsenal, Sebastopol, whence the Russian fleet had sailed to Sinope, and in September, 1854, the allied armies landed in the Crimea. On the 20th the Russian army, strongly posted on the banks of the Alma, was completely defeated, and it is almost certain that, if the victory had been at once followed up, Sebastopol would have fallen. The commanders of the allied armies, however, hesitated to throw themselves against the forts erected to the north of the town, and decided on the hazardous task of marching round Sebastopol and attacking it from the south. The movement was successfully carried out, but the allies again hesitated to attempt an immediate assault. The Russians, who were advised by Colonel Todleben, the only military man who attained a great reputation in the war, thus gained time to strengthen their position by earth-works; and the allies found themselves forced, with scanty preparations, to undertake a regular siege against an enemy whose force was numerically superior to their own. In the early days of the siege, indeed, the allied armies were twice in great peril. A formidable attack on the 20th October on the British position at Balaclava led to a series of encounters which displayed the bravery of British troops, but did not enhance the reputation of British commanders. A still more formidable sortie on the 5th of November was with difficulty repulsed at Inkerman. And the Russians soon afterwards found, in the climate of the country, a powerful ally. The allied armies, imperfectly organised, and badly equipped for such a campaign, suffered severely from the hardships of a Crimean winter. The whole expedition seemed likely to melt away from want and disease.


PALMERSTON'S MINISTRY

The terrible condition of the army, vividly described in the letters which the war correspondents of the newspapers sent home, aroused strong feelings of indignation in Great Britain. When parliament met, Mr. Roebuck gave notice that he would move for a committee of inquiry. Lord John Russell—who had already vainly urged in the cabinet that the duke of Newcastle should be superseded, and the conduct of the war intrusted to a stronger minister—resigned office. His resignation was followed by the defeat of the government, and Lord Aberdeen, thus driven from power, was succeeded by Lord Palmerston. In selecting him for the post, the queen undoubtedly placed her seal on the wish of the country to carry out the war to the bitter

[1855-1856 A.D.]

end. But it so happened that the formation of a new ministry was accompanied by a fresh effort to make terms of peace. Before the change of administration a conference had been decided on, and Lord Palmerston intrusted its management to Lord John Russell. While the latter was on his way to Vienna an event occurred which seemed at first to facilitate his task. The czar, worn out with disappointment, suddenly died, and was succeeded by his son Alexander. Unfortunately the conference failed, and the war went on for another year. In September, 1855, the allied troops succeeded in obtaining possession of the southern side of Sebastopol, and the emperor of the French, satisfied with this partial success, or alarmed at the expense of the war, decided on withdrawing from the struggle. The attitude of Napoleon made the conclusion of peace only a question of time. In the beginning of 1856 a congress to discuss the terms was assembled at Paris; in February hostilities were suspended, and in April a treaty was concluded. The peace set back the boundaries of Russia from the Danube to the Pruth; it secured the free navigation of the first of these rivers; it opened the Black Sea to the commercial navies of the world, closing it to vessels of war and forbidding the establishment of arsenals upon its shores. The last condition, to which Great Britain attached most importance, endured for about fourteen years. Peace without this provision could undoubtedly have been secured at Vienna, and the prolongation of the war from 1855 to 1856 only resulted in securing this arrangement for a little more than one decade.*





CHAPTER V

HALF A CENTURY OF PROGRESS

[1856-1900 A.D.]

THE Crimean War left other legacies behind it. The British government had for some time regarded with anxiety the gradual encroachments of Russia in central Asia. Russian diplomacy was exerting an increasing influence in Persia, and the latter had always coveted the city of Herat, which was popularly regarded as the gate of India. In 1856 the Persian government, believing that England had her hands fully occupied in the Crimea, seized Herat, and, in consequence, a fresh war—in which a British army under Sir James Outram rapidly secured a victory—broke out. The campaign, entered upon when parliament was not in session, was unpopular in the country. A grave constitutional question, which was ultimately settled by legislation, was raised as to the right of the government to undertake military operations beyond the boundaries of India without the consent of parliament. But the incidents of the Persian War were soon forgotten in the presence of a still graver crisis; for in the following year, 1857, the country suddenly found itself involved in war with China, and face to face with one of the greatest dangers which it has ever encountered—the mutiny of the Sepoy army in India. The Chinese War arose from the seizure by the Chinese authorities of a small vessel, the *Arrow*, commanded by a British subject, and at one time holding a license (which, however, had expired at the time of the seizure) from the British superintendent at Hong-Kong, and the detention of her crew on the charge of piracy. Sir John Bowring, who represented Great Britain in China, failing to secure the reparation and apology which he demanded, directed the British admiral to bombard Canton. Lord Palmerston's cabinet decided to approve and support Sir John Bowring's vigorous action. Mr.

[1857-1858 A.D.]

Cobden, however, brought forward a motion in the house of commons condemning these high-handed proceedings. He succeeded in securing the co-operation of his own friends, of Lord John Russell, and of other independent liberals, as well as of the conservative party, and in inflicting a signal defeat on the government. Lord Palmerston at once appealed from the house to the country. The constituencies, imperfectly acquainted with the technical issues involved in the dispute, rallied to the minister, who was upholding British interests. Lord Palmerston obtained a decisive victory, and returned to power apparently in irresistible strength. Lord Elgin had already been sent to China with a considerable force to support the demand for redress. On his way thither he learned that the British in India were reduced to the last extremities by the mutiny of the native army in Bengal, and, on the application of Lord Canning, the governor-general, he decided on diverting the troops, intended to bring the Chinese to reason, to the more pressing duty of saving India for the British crown.

INDIAN MUTINY

During the years which had followed the accession of the queen, the territories and responsibilities of the East India Company had been considerably enlarged by the annexation of Scinde by Lord Ellenborough, the conquest of the Punjab after two desperate military campaigns under Lord Dalhousie, the conquest of Pegu, and the annexation of Oudh. These great additions to the empire had naturally imposed an increased strain on the Indian troops, while the British garrison, instead of being augmented, had been depleted to meet the necessities of the Russian war. Several circumstances, moreover, tended to propagate disaffection in the Indian army. Indian troops operating outside the company's dominions were granted increased allowances, but these were automatically reduced when conquest brought the provinces in which they were serving within the British pale. The Sepoys again had an ineradicable dislike to serve beyond the sea, and the invasion of Pegu necessitated their transport by water to the seat of war. Finally, the invention of a new rifle led to the introduction of a cartridge which, though it was officially denied at the moment, was in fact lubricated with a mixture of cow's fat and lard. The Sepoys thought that their caste would be destroyed if they touched the fat of the sacred cow or unclean pig; they were even persuaded that the British government wished to destroy their caste in order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity. Isolated mutinies in Bengal were succeeded by much more serious events at Cawnpore in Oudh, and at Meerut in the North-west Provinces. From Meerut the mutineers, after some acts of outrage and murder, moved on Delhi, the capital of the old Mogul empire, which became the headquarters of the mutiny. In Oudh the native regiments placed themselves under a Mahratta chief, Nana Sahib, by whose orders the British in Cawnpore, including the women and children, were foully murdered. In the summer of 1857 these events seemed to imperil British rule in India. In the autumn the courage of the troops and the arrival of reinforcements gradually restored the British cause. Delhi, after a memorable siege, was at last taken by a brilliant assault. Lucknow, where a small British garrison was besieged in the Residency, was twice relieved, once temporarily by Sir James Outram and General Havelock, and afterwards permanently by Sir Colin Campbell, who had been sent out from England to take the chief command. Subsequent military operations broke up the remnants of the revolt, and in the beginning of 1858 the authority of the queen was restored throughout India. The

mutiny, however, had impressed its lesson on the British people, and, as the first consequence, it was decided to transfer the government from the old East India Company to the crown. Lord Palmerston's administration was defeated on another issue before it succeeded in carrying the measure which it introduced for the purpose, though Lord Derby's second ministry, which succeeded it, was compelled to frame its proposals on somewhat similar lines. The home government of India was intrusted to a secretary of state, with a council to assist him; and though the numbers of the council have been reduced, the form of government which was then established has endured.

ORSINI

The cause which led to the second fall of Lord Palmerston was in one sense unexpected. Some Italian refugees living in London, of whom Orsini was the chief, formed a design to assassinate the emperor of the French. On the evening of 14th January, 1858, while the emperor, accompanied by the empress, was driving to the opera, these men threw some bombs under his carriage. The brutal attempt happily failed. Neither the emperor nor the empress was injured by the explosion, but the carriage in which they were driving was wrecked, and a large number of persons who happened to be in the street at the time were either killed or wounded. This horrible outrage naturally created indignation in France, and it unfortunately became plain that the conspiracy had been hatched in England and that the bombs had been manufactured in Birmingham. On these facts becoming known, Count Walewski, the chief of the French foreign office, who was united by ties of blood to the emperor, called on the British government to provide against the danger to which France was exposed. "Ought the right of asylum to protect such a state of things?" he asked. "Is hospitality due to assassins? Ought the British legislature to continue to favour their designs and their plans? And can it continue to shelter persons who by these flagrant acts place themselves beyond the pale of common rights?" Lord Clarendon, the head of the British foreign office, told the French ambassador, who read him this despatch, that "no consideration on earth would induce the British parliament to pass a measure for the extradition of political refugees," but he added that it was a question whether the law was as complete and as stringent as it should be, and he stated that the government had already referred the whole subject to the law officers of the crown for their consideration. Having made these remarks, however, he judged it wise to refrain from giving any formal reply to Count Walewski's despatch, and contented himself with privately communicating to the British ambassador in Paris the difficulties of the British government. After receiving the opinion of the law officers the cabinet decided to introduce a bill into parliament increasing in England the punishment for a conspiracy to commit a felony either within or without the United Kingdom. The first reading of this bill was passed by a considerable majority. But, before the bill came on for a second reading, the language which was being used in France created strong resentment in England. The regiments of the French army sent addresses to the emperor congratulating him on his escape and violently denouncing the British people. Some of these addresses, which were published in the *Moniteur*, spoke of London as "an assassins' den," and invited the emperor to give his troops the order to destroy it. Such language did not make it easier to alter the law in the manner desired by the government. The house of commons, reflecting the spirit of the country, blamed Lord Clarendon for neglecting to answer Count

[1858 A.D.]

Walewski's despatch, and blamed Lord Palmerston for introducing a bill at French dictation. The feeling was so strong that, when the Conspiracy bill came on for a second reading, an amendment hostile to the government was carried, and Lord Palmerston at once resigned.

LORD DERBY'S SECOND MINISTRY (1858-1859 A.D.)

For a second time Lord Derby undertook the difficult task of carrying on the work of government without the support of a majority of the house of commons. If the liberal party had been united his attempt would have failed immediately. In 1858, however, the liberal party had no cohesion. The wave of popularity which had carried Lord Palmerston to victory in 1857 had lost its strength. The radicals, who were slowly recovering the influence they had lost during the Crimean War, regarded even a conservative government as preferable to his return to power, while many liberals desired to intrust the fortunes of their party to the guidance of their former chief, Lord John Russell. It was obvious to most men that the dissensions thus visible in the liberal ranks could be more easily healed in the cold shade of the opposition benches than in the warmer sunlight of office. And therefore, though no one had much confidence in Lord Derby, or in the stability of his second administration, every one was disposed to acquiesce in its temporary occupation of office.

Ministries which exist by sufferance are necessarily compelled to adapt their measures to the wishes of those who permit them to continue in power. The second ministry of Lord Derby experienced the truth of this rule. For some years a controversy had been conducted in the legislature in reference to the admission of the Jews to parliament. This dispute had been raised in 1847 into a question of practical moment by the election of Baron Rothschild as representative of the city of London, and its importance had been emphasized in 1851 by the return of another Jew, Alderman Salomons, for another constituency. The liberal party generally in the house of commons was in favour of such a modification of the oaths as would enable the Jews so elected to take their seats. The bulk of the conservative party, on the contrary, and the house of lords, were strenuously opposed to the change. Early in 1858 the house of commons, by an increased majority, passed a bill amending the oaths imposed by law on members of both houses, and directing the omission of the words "on the true faith of a Christian" from the oath of adjuration when it was taken by a Jew. If the conservatives had remained in opposition there can be little doubt that this bill would have shared the fate of its predecessors and have been rejected by the lords. The lord chancellor, indeed, in speaking upon the clause relieving the Jews, expressed a hope that the peers would not hesitate to pronounce that our "Lord is king, be the people never so impatient." But some conservative peers realised the inconvenience of maintaining a conflict between the two houses when the conservatives were in power; and Lord Lucan, who had commanded the cavalry in the Crimea, suggested as a compromise that either house should be authorised by resolution to determine the form of oath to be administered to its members. This solution was reluctantly accepted by Lord Derby, and Baron Rothschild was thus enabled to take the seat from which he had been so long excluded. Eight years afterwards parliament was induced to take a fresh step in advance. It imposed a new oath from which the words which disqualified the Jews were omitted. The door of the house of lords was thus thrown open, and Baron Rothschild, raised to the peerage, was enabled to take his seat in the upper chamber.

Reform Bill (1859 A.D.)

This question was not the only one on which a conservative government, without a majority at its back, was compelled to make concessions. For some years past a growing disposition had been displayed among the more earnest liberals to extend the provisions of the Reform Act of 1832. Lord John Russell's ministry had been defeated in 1851 on a proposal of Mr. Locke King to place £10 householders in counties on the same footing as regards the franchise as £10 householders in towns, and Lord John himself in 1854 had actually introduced a new Reform bill. After the general election of 1857 the demand for reform increased, and, in accepting office in 1858, Lord Derby thought it necessary to declare that, though he had maintained in opposition that the settlement of 1832, with all its anomalies, afforded adequate representation to all classes, the promises of previous governments and the expectations of the people imposed on him the duty of bringing forward legislation on the subject. The scheme which Lord Derby's government adopted was peculiar. Its chief proposal was the extension of the county franchise to £10 householders. But it also proposed that persons possessing a 40s. freehold in a borough should in future have a vote in the borough in which their property was situated, and not in the county. The bill also conferred the franchise on holders of a certain amount of stock, on depositors in savings banks, on graduates of universities, and on other persons qualified by position or education. The defect of the bill was that it did nothing to meet the only real need of reform—the enfranchisement of a certain proportion of the working classes. On the contrary, in this respect it perpetuated the settlement of 1832. The £10 householder was still to furnish the bulk of the electorate, and the ordinary working man could not afford to pay £10 a year for his house. While the larger proposals of the bill were thus open to grave objection, its subsidiary features provoked ridicule. The suggestions that votes should be conferred on graduates and stockholders were laughed at as "fancy franchises." The bill, moreover, was not brought forward with the authority of a united cabinet. Two members of the government—Mr. Spencer Walpole and Mr. Henley—declined to be responsible for its provisions, and placed their resignations in Lord Derby's hands. In Mr. Walpole's judgment the bill was objectionable because it afforded no reasonable basis for a stable settlement. There was nothing in a £10 franchise which was capable of permanent defence, and if it was at once applied to counties as well as boroughs it would sooner or later be certain to be extended. He himself advocated with some force that it would be wiser and more popular to fix the county franchise at £20 and the borough franchise at £6 ratable value; and he contended that such a settlement could be defended on the old principle that taxation and representation should go together, for £20 was the minimum rent at which the house tax commenced, and a ratable value of £6 was the point at which the householder could not compound to pay his rates through his landlord. Weakened by the defection of two of its more important members, the government had little chance of obtaining the acceptance of its scheme. An amendment of Lord John Russell, condemning its main provisions, was adopted in an unusually full house by a substantial majority, and the cabinet had no alternative but to resign or dissolve. It chose the latter course. The general election, which almost immediately took place, increased to some extent the strength of the conservative party. For the first time since their secession from Sir Robert Peel the conservatives commanded more than three hundred votes in the house of commons, but this increased strength was not sufficient

[1859-1860 A.D.]

to insure them a majority. When the new parliament assembled, Lord Hartington, the eldest son of the duke of Devonshire, was put forward to propose a direct vote of want of confidence in the administration. It was carried by 323 votes to 310, and the second Derby administration came to an end.

PALMERSTON'S SECOND MINISTRY (1859 A.D.)

It was plain that the house of commons had withdrawn its support from Lord Derby, but it was not clear that any other leading politician would be able to form a government. The jealousies between Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston still existed; the more extreme men, who were identified with the policy of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, had little confidence in either of these statesmen; and it was still uncertain whether the able group who had been the friends of Sir Robert Peel would finally gravitate to the conservative or to the liberal camp. The queen, on the advice of Lord Derby, endeavoured to solve the first of these difficulties by sending for Lord Granville, who led the liberal party in the lords, and authorising him to form a government which should combine, as far as possible, all the more prominent liberals. The attempt, however, failed, and the queen thereupon fell back upon Lord Palmerston. Lord John Russell agreed to accept office as foreign minister; Mr. Gladstone consented to take the chancellorship of the exchequer. Mr. Cobden was offered, but declined, the presidency of the board of trade; and the post which he refused was conferred on a prominent free-trader, who had associated himself with Mr. Cobden's fortunes, Mr. Milner Gibson. Thus Lord Palmerston had succeeded in combining in one ministry the various representatives of political progress. He had secured the support of the Peelites, who had left him after the fall of Lord Aberdeen in 1855, and of the free-traders, who had done so much to defeat him in 1857 and 1858. His new administration was accordingly based on a broader bottom, and contained greater elements of strength than his former cabinet. And the country was requiring more stable government. The three first ministries of the queen had endured from the spring of 1835 to the spring of 1852, or for very nearly seventeen years; but the next seven years had seen the formation and dissolution of no less than four cabinets. It was felt that these frequent changes were unfortunate for the country, and every one was glad to welcome the advent of a government which seemed to promise greater permanence. That promise was fulfilled. The administration which Lord Palmerston succeeded in forming in 1859 endured till his death in 1865, and with slight modifications, under its second chief Lord John (afterwards Earl) Russell, till the summer of 1866. It had thus a longer life than any cabinet which had governed England since the first Reform Act. But it owed its lasting character to the benevolence of its opponents rather than to the enthusiasm of its supporters. The conservatives learned to regard the veteran statesman, who had combined all sections of liberals under his banner, as the most powerful champion of conservative principles; a virtual truce of parties was established during his continuance in office; and, for the most part of his ministry, a tacit understanding existed that the minister, on his side, should pursue a conservative policy, and that the conservatives, on theirs, should abstain from any real attempt to oust him from power. Lord John Russell, indeed, was too earnest in his desire for reform to abstain from one serious effort to accomplish it. Early in 1860 he proposed, with the sanction of the cabinet, a measure providing for the extension of the county franchise to £10 householders, of the borough franchise to £6 householders, and for a moderate redistribution of seats.

[1860 A.D.]

But the country, being in enjoyment of considerable prosperity, paid only a languid attention to the scheme; its indifference was reflected in the house; the conservatives were encouraged in their opposition by the lack of interest which the new bill excited, and the almost unconcealed dislike of the prime minister to its provisions. The bill, thus steadily opposed, and half-heartedly supported, made only slow progress; and at last it was withdrawn by its author. He did not again attempt during Lord Palmerston's life to re-introduce the subject. Absorbed in the work of the foreign office, which at this time was abnormally active, he refrained from pressing home the arguments for internal reform.

Mr. Gladstone's Budgets

In one important department, however, the ministry departed from the conservative policy it pursued in other matters. Mr. Gladstone signalised his return to the exchequer by introducing a series of budgets which excited keen opposition at the time, but in the result largely added to the prosperity of the country. The first of these great budgets, in 1860, was partly inspired by the necessity of adapting the fiscal system to meet the requirements of a commercial treaty which, mainly through Mr. Cobden's exertions, had been concluded with the emperor of the French. The treaty bound France to reduce her duties on English coal and iron, and on many manufactured articles; while, in return, Great Britain undertook to sweep away the duties on all manufactured goods, and largely to reduce those on French wines. But Mr. Gladstone was not content with these great alterations, which involved a loss of nearly £1,200,000 a year to the exchequer; he voluntarily undertook to sacrifice another million on what he called a supplemental measure of customs reform. He proposed to repeal the duties on paper, by which means he hoped to increase the opportunities of providing cheap literature for the people. The budget of 1860 produced a protracted controversy. The French Treaty excited more criticism than enthusiasm on both sides of the channel. In France the manufacturers complained that they would be unable to stand against the competition of English goods. In England many people thought that Great Britain was wasting her resources and risking her supremacy by giving the French increased facilities for taking her iron, coal, and machinery, and that no adequate advantage could result from the greater consumption of cheap claret. But the criticism which the French Treaty aroused was drowned in the clamour which was created by the proposed repeal of the paper duties. The manufacture of paper was declared to be a struggling industry, which would be destroyed by the withdrawal of protection. The dissemination of cheap literature, and the multiplication of cheap newspapers, could not compensate the nation for the ruin of an important trade. If money could be spared, moreover, for the remission of taxation, the paper duties were much less oppressive than those on some other articles. The tax on tea, for example, which had been raised during the late war to no less than 1s. 5d. a lb, was much more injurious; and it would be far wiser—so it was contended—to reduce the duty on tea than to abandon the duties on paper.

Paper Duties Repealed

Notwithstanding the opposition which the Paper Duties Bill undoubtedly excited, the proposal was carried in the commons; it was, however, thrown out in the lords, and its rejection led to a crisis which seemed at one time to threaten the good relations between the two houses of parliament. It was

[1860-1861 A.D.]

argued that if the lords had the right to reject a measure remitting existing duties, they had in effect the right of imposing taxation, since there was no material difference between the adoption of a new tax and the continuance of an old one which the commons had determined to repeal. Lord Palmerston, however, with some tact postponed the controversy for the time by obtaining the appointment of committees to search for precedents; and, after the report of the committee, he moved a series of resolutions affirming the right of the commons to grant aids and supplies as their exclusive privilege, stating that the occasional rejection of financial measures by the lords had always been regarded with peculiar jealousy, but declaring that the commons had the remedy in their own hands by so framing bills of supply as to secure their acceptance. In accordance with this suggestion the commons in the following year again resolved to repeal the paper duties; but, instead of embodying their decision in a separate bill, they included it in the same measure which dealt with all the financial arrangements of the year, and thus drew on the lords the responsibility of either accepting the proposal, or of paralysing the whole machinery of administration by depriving the crown of the supplies which were required for the public services. The lords were not prepared to risk this result, and they accordingly accepted a reform which they could no longer resist, and the bill became law.

In order to enable him to accomplish these great changes, Mr. Gladstone temporarily raised the income tax, which he found at 9*d.* in the pound, to 10*d.* But the result of his reforms was so marked that he was speedily able to reduce it. The revenue increased by leaps and bounds, and the income tax was gradually reduced till it stood at 4*d.* in the closing years of the administration.

During the same period the duty on tea was reduced from 1*s.* 5*d.* to 6*d.* in the pound; and the national debt was diminished from rather more than £800,000,000 to rather less than £780,000,000, the charge for the debt declining mainly through the falling in of the long annuities, by some £2,600,000 a year. With the possible exception of Sir Robert Peel's term of office, no previous period of British history had been memorable for a series of more remarkable financial reforms. Their success redeemed the character of the administration. The liberals, who complained that their leaders were pursuing a conservative policy, could at least console themselves by the reflection that the chancellor of the exchequer was introducing satisfactory budgets. The language, moreover, which Mr. Gladstone was holding on other subjects encouraged the more advanced liberals to expect that he would ultimately place himself at the head of the party of progress. This expectation was the more remarkable because Mr. Gladstone was the representative in the cabinet of the old conservative party which Sir Robert Peel had led to victory. As lately as 1858 he had reluctantly refused to serve under Lord Derby; he was still a member of the Carlton Club; he sat for the University of Oxford; and on many questions he displayed a constant sympathy with conservative traditions. Yet, on all the chief domestic questions which came before parliament in Lord Palmerston's second administration, Mr. Gladstone almost invariably took a more liberal view than his chief. It was understood, indeed, that the relations between the two men were not always harmonious; that Lord Palmerston disapproved the resolute conduct of Mr. Gladstone, and that Mr. Gladstone deplored the conservative tendencies of Lord Palmerston. It was believed that Mr. Gladstone on more than one occasion desired to escape from a position which he disliked by resigning office, and that the resignation was only averted through a consciousness that the ministry could not afford to lose its most eloquent member.

China War (1859-1860 A.D.)

While on domestic matters other than those affecting finance the liberal ministry was pursuing a conservative policy, its members were actively engaged on, and the attention of the public was keenly directed to, affairs abroad. For the period was one of foreign unrest, and the wars which were then waged have left an enduring mark on the map of the world, and have affected the position of the Anglo-Saxon race for all time. In the far East, the operations which it had been decided to undertake in China were necessarily postponed on account of the diversion of the forces, intended to exact redress at Peking, to the suppression of mutiny in India. It was only late in 1858 that Lord Elgin and Baron Gros, the French plenipotentiary (for France joined England in securing simultaneous redress for grievances of her own), were enabled to obtain suitable reparation. It was arranged that the treaty, which was then provisionally concluded at Tientsin, should be ratified at Peking in the following year; and in June, 1859, Mr. Bruce, Lord Elgin's brother, who had been appointed plenipotentiary, attempted to proceed up the Peiho with the object of securing its ratification. The allied squadron, however, was stopped by the forts at the mouth of the Peiho,¹ which fired on the vessels; a landing party, which was disembarked to storm the forts met with a disastrous check, and the squadron had to retire with an acknowledged loss of three gunboats and 400 men. This reverse necessitated fresh operations, and in 1860 Lord Elgin and Baron Gros were directed to return to China, and, at the head of an adequate force, were instructed to exact an apology for the attack on the allied fleets, the ratification and execution of the Treaty of Tientsin, and the payment of an indemnity for the expenses of the war.

The weakness of the Chinese Empire was not appreciated at that time; the unfortunate incident on the Peiho in the previous summer had created an exaggerated impression of the strength of the Chinese arms, and some natural anxiety was felt for the success of the expedition. But the allied armies met with no serious resistance. The Chinese, indeed, endeavoured to delay their progress by negotiation rather than by force; and they succeeded in treacherously arresting some distinguished persons who had been sent into the Chinese lines to negotiate. But by the middle of October the Chinese army was decisively defeated; Peking was occupied; those British and French prisoners who had not succumbed to the hardships of their confinement were liberated; Lord Elgin determined on teaching the rulers of China a lesson by the destruction of the summer palace;² and the Chinese government was compelled to submit to the terms of the allies, and to ratify the Treaty of Tientsin. There is no doubt that these operations helped to open the Chinese markets to British trade; but incidentally, by regulating the emigration of Chinese coolies, they had the unforeseen effect of exposing the industrial markets of the world to the serious competition of cheap "yellow" labour. A distinguished foreign statesman observed that Lord Palmerston had made a mistake. He thought that he had opened China to Europe; instead, he had let out the Chinese. It was perhaps a happier result of the war that it tended to the continuance of the Anglo-French alliance. French and British troops had again co-operated in a joint enterprise, and had shared the dangers and successes of a campaign.

[¹ Also known as the Taku forts.]

[² Much oriental treasure—rare vases, jewels, and curiosities—was carried off as loot by the French.]

[1859-1860 A. D.]

Unification of Italy

War was not confined to China. In the beginning of 1859 diplomatists were alarmed at the language addressed by the emperor of the French to the Austrian ambassador at Paris, which seemed to breathe the menace of a rupture. Notwithstanding the exertions which Great Britain made to avert hostilities, the provocation of Count Cavour induced Austria to declare war against Piedmont, and Napoleon thereupon moved to the support of his ally, promising to free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic. As a matter of fact, the attitude of northern Germany, which was massing troops on the Rhine, and the defenceless condition of France, which was drained of soldiers for the Italian campaign, induced the emperor to halt before he had carried out his purpose, and terms of peace were hastily concerted at Villafranca, and were afterwards confirmed at Zurich, by which Lombardy was given to Piedmont, while Austria was left in possession of Venice and the Quadrilateral, and central Italy was restored to its former rulers. The refusal of the Italians to take back the Austrian grand dukes made the execution of these arrangements impracticable. Napoleon, indeed, used his influence to carry them into effect; but Lord John Russell, who was now in charge of the British foreign office, and who had Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone on his side in the cabinet, gave a vigorous support to the claim of the Italians that their country should be allowed to regulate her own affairs. The French emperor had ultimately to yield to the determination of the inhabitants of central Italy, when it was backed by the arguments of the British foreign office, and Tuscany, Modena, Parma, as well as a portion of the States of the Church, were united to Piedmont. There was no doubt that through the whole of the negotiations the Italians were largely indebted to the labours of Lord John Russell. They recognised that they owed more to the moral support of England than to the armed assistance of France. The French emperor, moreover, took a step which lost him the sympathy of many Italians. Before the war he had arranged with Count Cavour that France should receive, as the price of her aid, the duchy of Savoy and the county of Nice.

After Villafranca, the emperor, frankly recognising that he had only half kept his promise, consented to waive his claim to these provinces. But, when he found himself unable to resist the annexation of central Italy to Piedmont, he reverted to the old arrangement. The formation of a strong Piedmontese kingdom, with the spoliation of the papal dominion, was unpopular in France; and he thought—perhaps naturally—that he must have something to show his people in return for sacrifices which had cost him the lives of 50,000 French soldiers, and concessions which the whole Catholic party in France resented. Count Cavour consented to pay the price which Napoleon thus exacted, and the frontier of France was accordingly extended to the Alps. But it is very doubtful whether Napoleon did not lose more than he gained by this addition to his territory. It certainly cost him the active friendship of Great Britain. The Anglo-French alliance had been already strained by the language of the French colonels in 1858 and the Franco-Austrian War of 1859; it never fully recovered from the shock which it received by the evidence, which the annexation of Savoy and Nice gave, of the ambition of the French emperor. The British people gave way to what Mr. Cobden called the last of the three panics. Lord Palmerston proposed and carried the provision of a large sum of money for the fortification of the coasts; and the volunteer movement, which had its origin in 1859, received a remarkable stimulus in

1860. In this year the course of events in Italy emphasised the differences between the policy of Great Britain and that of France. Garibaldi, with a thousand followers, made his famous descent on the coast of Sicily. After making himself master of that island, he crossed over to the mainland, drove the king of Naples out of his capital, and forced him to take refuge in Gaeta. In France these events were regarded with dismay. The emperor wished to stop Garibaldi's passage across the strait, and stationed his fleet at Gaeta to protect the king of Naples. Lord John Russell, on the contrary, welcomed Garibaldi's success with enthusiasm. He declined to intervene in the affairs of Italy by confining the great liberator to Sicily; he protested against the presence of the French fleet at Gaeta; and when other foreign nations denounced the conduct of Piedmont, he defended it by quoting Vattel and citing the example of William III. When, finally, Italian troops entered the dominions of the pope, France withdrew her ambassador from the court of Turin and England under Lord John Russell's advice at once recognised the new kingdom of Italy.

Schleswig-Holstein Question

In these great events—for the union of Italy was the greatest fact which had been accomplished in Europe since the fall of the first Napoleon—the British ministry had undoubtedly acquired credit. It was everywhere felt that the new kingdom owed much to the moral support which had been steadily and consistently given to it by Great Britain. Soon afterwards, however, in the autumn of 1863, the death of the king of Denmark led to a new revolution in the north of Europe, in which Lord Palmerston's government displayed less resolution and lost much of the prestige which it had acquired by its Italian policy. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein had been for centuries united to the kingdom of Denmark by the golden link of the crown; in other respects they had been organically kept distinct, while one of them—Holstein—was a member of the German confederation. The succession to the crown of Denmark, however, was different from that in the duchies. In Denmark the crown could descend, as it descends in Great Britain, through females. In the duchies the descent was confined to the male line; and, as Frederick VII, who ascended the Danish throne in 1848, had no direct issue, the next heir to the crown of Denmark under this rule was Prince Christian of Glücksburg, afterwards king; the next heir to the duchies being the duke of Augustenburg. In 1850 an arrangement had been made to prevent the separation of the duchies from the kingdom. As a result of a conference held in London, the duke of Augustenburg was induced to renounce his claim on the receipt of a large sum of money. Most of the great powers of Europe were parties to this plan. But the German confederation was not represented at the conference, and was not therefore committed to its conclusions. During the reign of Frederick VII the Danish government endeavoured to cement the alliance between the duchies and the kingdom, and specially to separate the interests of Schleswig, which was largely Danish in its sympathies, from those of Holstein, which was almost exclusively German. With this object, in the last year of his life, Frederick VII granted Holstein autonomous institutions, and bound Schleswig more closely to the Danish monarchy. The new King Christian IX confirmed this arrangement. The German diet at Frankfort at once protested against it. Following up words with acts it decided on occupying Holstein, and it delegated the duty of carrying out its order to Hanover and Saxony.

[1863-1864 A.D.]

While federal execution was taking place, the duke of Augustenburg—regardless of the arrangements to which he had consented—delegated his rights in the duchies to his son, who formally claimed the succession. So far the situation, which was serious enough, had been largely dependent on the action of Germany. In the closing days of 1863 it passed mainly into the control of the two chief German powers. In Prussia Bismarck had lately become prime minister, and was animated by ambitious projects for his country's aggrandisement. Austria, afraid of losing her influence in Germany, followed the lead of Prussia, and the two powers required Denmark to cancel the arrangements which Frederick VII had made, and which Christian IX had confirmed, threatening in case of refusal to follow up the occupation of Holstein by that of Schleswig. As the Danes gave only a provisional assent to the demand, Prussian and Austrian troops entered Schleswig. These events created much excitement in England. The great majority of the British people, who imperfectly understood the merits of the case, were unanimous in their desire to support Denmark by arms. Their wish had been accentuated by the circumstance that the marriage in the previous spring of the prince of Wales to the daughter of the new king of Denmark had given them an almost personal interest in the struggle. Lord Palmerston had publicly expressed the views of the people by declaring that, if Denmark were attacked, her assailants would not have to deal with Denmark alone. The language of the public press and of Englishmen visiting Denmark confirmed the impression which the words of the prime minister had produced; and there is unfortunately no doubt that Denmark was encouraged to resist her powerful opponents by the belief, which she was thus almost authorised in entertaining, that she could reckon in the hour of her danger on the active assistance of the United Kingdom.

If Lord Palmerston had been supported by his cabinet, or if he had been a younger man, he might possibly, in 1864, have made good the words which he had rashly uttered in 1863. But the queen, who, it is fair to add, understood the movement which was tending to German unity much better than most of her advisers, was averse from war. A large section of the cabinet shared the queen's hesitation, and Lord Palmerston—with the weight of nearly eighty summers upon him—was not strong enough to enforce his will against both his sovereign and his colleagues. He made some attempt to ascertain whether the emperor of the French would support him if he went to war. But he found that the emperor had not much fancy for a struggle which would have restored Holstein to Denmark; and that, if he went to war at all, his chief object would be the liberation of Venice and the rectification of his own frontiers. Even Lord Palmerston shrank from entering on a campaign which would have involved all Europe in conflagration, and would have unsettled the boundaries of most continental nations; and the British government endeavoured thenceforward to stop hostilities by referring the question immediately in dispute to a conference in London. The labours of the conference proved abortive. Its members were unable to agree upon any methods of settlement, and the war went on. Denmark, naturally unable to grapple with her powerful antagonist, was forced to yield, and the two duchies, which were the subject of the dispute, were taken from her.

The full consequences of this struggle were not visible at the time. It was impossible to foresee that it was the first step which was to carry Prussia forward, under her ambitious minister, to a position of acknowledged supremacy on the Continent. But the results to Great Britain were plain enough. She had been mighty in words and weak in deeds. It was no doubt open to her to

contend, as perhaps most wise people consider, that the cause of Denmark was not of sufficient importance to justify her in going to war. But it was not open to her to encourage a weak power to resist, and then desert her in the hour of her necessity. Lord Palmerston should not have used the language which he employed in 1863, if he had not decided that his brave words would be followed by brave action. His conduct lowered the prestige of Great Britain at least as much as his Italian policy had raised it. Continental statesmen thenceforward assumed that Great Britain, however much she might protest, would not resort to arms, and the influence of England suffered, as it was bound to suffer, in consequence.

American Civil War

Meanwhile, in this period of warfare, another struggle was being fought out on a still greater scale in North America. The election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency of the United States emphasised the fact that the majority of the inhabitants of the Northern States were opposed to the continuance of slavery; and, in the beginning of 1861, several of the Southern States formally seceded from the Union. A steamer sent by the Federal government with reinforcements to Fort Sumter was fired upon, and both parties made preparations for the civil war which was apparently inevitable. On the one side the Confederate States—as the seceding States were called—were animated by a resolution to protect their property. On the other side the “conscience” of the North was excited by a passionate desire to wipe out the blot of slavery. Thus both parties were affected by some of the most powerful considerations which can influence mankind, while the North were further actuated by the natural incentive to preserve the Union, which was threatened with disruption. The progress of the great struggle was watched with painful attention in England. The most important manufacturing interest in England was paralysed by the loss of the raw cotton, which was obtained almost exclusively from the United States, and tens of thousands of work-people were thrown out of employment. The distress which resulted naturally created a strong feeling in favour of intervention, which might terminate the war and open the Southern ports to British commerce; and the initial successes which the Confederates secured seemed to afford some justification for such a proceeding. In the course of 1862 indeed, when the Confederate armies had secured many victories, Mr. Gladstone, speaking at Newcastle, used the famous expression that President Jefferson Davis had “made a nation”; and Lord Palmerston’s language in the house of commons—while opposing a motion for the recognition of the South—induced the impression that his thoughts were tending in the same direction as Mr. Gladstone’s. The emperor Napoleon, in July of the same year, confidentially asked the British minister whether the moment had not come for recognising the South; and in the following September Lord Palmerston was himself disposed in concert with France to offer to mediate on the basis of separation. Soon afterwards, however, the growing exhaustion of the South improved the prospects of the Northern States; an increasing number of persons in Great Britain objected to interfere in the interests of slavery; and the combatants were allowed to fight out their quarrel without the interference of Europe.

At the beginning of the war, Lord John Russell (who was made a peer as Earl Russell in 1861) acknowledged the Southern States as belligerents. His decision caused some ill-feeling at Washington; but it was inevitable. For the North had proclaimed a blockade of the Southern ports; and it would

[1861-1862 A.D.]

have been both inconvenient and unfair if Lord Russell had decided to recognise the blockade and had refused to acknowledge the belligerent rights of the Southern States. Lord Russell's decision, however, seemed to indicate some latent sympathy for the Southern cause; and the irritation which was felt in the North was increased by the news that the Southern States were accrediting two gentlemen to represent them at Paris and at London. These emissaries, Messrs. Mason and Slidell, succeeded in running the blockade and in reaching Cuba, where they embarked on the *Trent*, a British mail steamer sailing for England. On her passage home the *Trent* was stopped by the Federal steamer *San Jacinto*; she was boarded, and Messrs. Mason and Slidell were arrested. There was no doubt that the captain of the *San Jacinto* had acted irregularly. While he had the right to stop the *Trent*, examine the mails, and, if he found despatches for the enemy among them, carry the vessel into an American port for adjudication, he had no authority to board the vessel and arrest two of her passengers. "The British government," to use its own language, "could not allow such an affront to the national honour to pass without due reparation." They decided on sending what practically amounted to an ultimatum to the Federal government, calling upon it to liberate the prisoners and to make a suitable apology. The presentation of this ultimatum, which was accompanied by the despatch of troops to Canada, was very nearly provoking war with the United States. If, indeed, the ultimatum had been presented in the form in which it was originally framed, war might have ensued. But at the prince consort's suggestion its language was considerably modified, and the responsibility for the outrage was thrown on the officer who committed it, and not on the government of the republic. It ought not to be forgotten that this important modification was the last service rendered to his adopted country by the prince consort before his fatal illness. He died before the answer to the despatch was received; and his death deprived the queen of an adviser who had stood by her side since the earlier days of her reign, and who, by his prudence and conduct, had done much to raise the tone of the court and the influence of the crown. Happily for the future of the world, the government of the United States felt itself able to accept the despatch which had been thus addressed to it, and to give the reparation which was demanded; and the danger of war between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race was averted. But, in the following summer, a new event excited fresh animosities, and aroused a controversy which endured for the best part of ten years.

The Confederates, naturally anxious to harass the commerce of their enemies, endeavoured from the commencement of hostilities to purchase armed cruisers from builders of neutral nations. In June, 1862, the American minister in London drew Lord Russell's attention to the fact that a vessel, lately launched at Messrs. Laird's yard at Birkenhead, was obviously intended to be employed as a Confederate cruiser. The solicitor to the commissioners of customs, however, considered that no facts had been revealed to authorise the detention of the vessel, and this opinion was reported in the beginning of July to the American minister, Mr. Adams. He thereupon supplied the government with additional facts, and at the same time furnished them with the opinion of an eminent English lawyer, Mr. Collier (afterwards Lord Monkswell), to the effect that "it would be difficult to make out a stronger case of infringement of the Foreign Enlistment Act, which if not enforced on this occasion is little better than a dead letter." These facts and this opinion were at once sent to the law officers. They reached the queen's advocate on Saturday, the 26th July; but, by an unfortunate mischance, the queen's

advocate had just been wholly incapacitated by a distressing illness; and the papers, in consequence, did not reach the attorney- and solicitor-general till the evening of the following Monday, when they at once advised the government to detain the vessel. Lord Russell thereupon sent orders to Liverpool for her detention. In the mean while the vessel—probably aware of the necessity for haste—had put to sea, and had commenced the career which made her famous as the *Alabama*. Ministers might even then have taken steps to stop the vessel by directing her detention in any British port to which she resorted for supplies. The cabinet, however, shrank from this course. The *Alabama* was allowed to prey on Federal commerce, and undoubtedly inflicted a vast amount of injury on the trade of the United States. In the autumn of 1862 Mr. Adams demanded redress for the injuries which had thus been sustained, and this demand was repeated for many years in stronger and stronger language. At last, in 1871, long after Lord Palmerston's death and Lord Russell's retirement, a joint commission was appointed to examine into the many cases of dispute which had arisen between the United States and Great Britain. The commissioners agreed upon three rules by which they thought neutrals should in future be bound, and recommended that they should be given a retrospective effect. They decided also that the claims which had arisen out of the depredations of the *Alabama* should be referred to arbitration. In the course of 1872 the arbitrators met at Geneva. Their finding was adverse to Great Britain, which was condemned to pay a large sum of money—more than £3,000,000—as compensation. A period of exceptional prosperity, which largely increased the revenue, enabled a chancellor of the exchequer to boast that the country had drunk itself out of the *Alabama* difficulty.

LORD RUSSELL'S SECOND MINISTRY

In October, 1865, Lord Palmerston's rule, which had been characterised by six years of political inaction at home and by constant disturbance abroad, was terminated by his death. The ministry, which had suffered many losses from death during its duration, was temporarily reconstructed under Lord Russell; and the new minister at once decided to put an end to the period of internal stagnation, which had lasted so long, by the introduction of a new Reform bill. Accordingly, in March, 1866, Mr. Gladstone, who now led the house of commons, introduced a measure which proposed to extend the county franchise to £14 and the borough franchise to £7 householders. The bill did not create much enthusiasm among liberals, and it was naturally opposed by the conservatives, who were reinforced by a large section of moderate liberals, nicknamed, in consequence of a phrase in one of Mr. Bright's speeches, Adullamites. After many debates, in which the commons showed little disposition to give the ministry any effective support, an amendment was carried by Lord Dunkellin, the eldest son of Lord Clanricarde, basing the borough franchise on rating instead of rental. The cabinet, recognising from the division that the control of the house had passed out of its hands, resigned office, and the queen was compelled to intrust Lord Derby with the task of forming a new administration.

LORD DERBY'S THIRD MINISTRY

For the third time in his career Lord Derby undertook the formidable task of conducting the government of the country with only a minority of the house of commons to support him. The moment at which he made this third

[1866-1867 A.D.]

attempt was one of unusual anxiety. Abroad, the almost simultaneous outbreak of war between Prussia and Austria was destined to affect the whole aspect of continental politics. At home, a terrible murrain had fallen on the cattle, inflicting ruin on the agricultural interest; a grave commercial crisis was creating alarm in the city of London, and, in its consequences, injuring the interests of labour; while the working classes, at last roused from their long indifference, and angry at the rejection of Lord Russell's bill, were assembling in their tens of thousands to demand reform. The cabinet determined to prohibit a meeting which the Reform League decided to hold in Hyde Park on the 23rd of July, and closed the gates of the park on the people. But the mob, converging on the park in thousands, surged round the railings, which a little inquiry might have shown were too weak to resist any real pressure. Either accidentally or intentionally, the railings were overturned in one place, and the people, perceiving their opportunity, at once threw them down round the whole circuit of the park. Few acts in Queen Victoria's reign were attended with greater consequences. For the riot in Hyde Park led almost directly to a new Reform act, and to the transfer of power from the middle classes to the masses of the people.

Reform (1867 A.D.)

Yet, though the new government found it necessary to introduce a Reform bill, a wide difference of opinion existed in the cabinet as to the form which the measure should take. Several of its members were in favour of assimilating the borough franchise to that in force in municipal elections, and practically conferring a vote on every householder who had three years' residence in the constituency. General Peel, however—Sir Robert Peel's brother—who held the seals of the war office, objected to this extension; and the cabinet ultimately decided on evading the difficulty by bringing forward a series of resolutions on which a scheme of reform might ultimately be based. Their success in 1858, in dealing with the government of India in this way, commended the decision to the acceptance of the cabinet. But it was soon apparent that the house of commons required a definite scheme, and that it would not seriously consider a set of abstract resolutions which committed no one to any distinct plan. Hence on the 23rd of February, 1867, the cabinet decided on withdrawing its resolutions and reverting to its original bill. On the following day Lord Cranborne—better known afterwards as Lord Salisbury—discovered that the bill had more democratic tendencies than he had originally supposed, and refused to be a party to it. On Monday, the 25th, the cabinet again met to consider the new difficulty which had thus arisen; and it decided (as was said afterwards by Sir John Pakington) in ten minutes to substitute for the scheme a mild measure extending the borough franchise to houses rated at £6 a year, and conferring the county franchise on £20 householders. The bill, it was soon obvious, would be acceptable to no one; and the government again fell back on its original proposal. Three members of the cabinet, however, Lord Cranborne, Lord Carnarvon, and General Peel, refused to be parties to the measure, and resigned office, the government being necessarily weakened by these defections. In the large scheme which the cabinet had now adopted the borough franchise was conferred on all householders rated to the relief of the poor, who had for two years occupied the houses which gave them the qualification; the county franchise was given to the occupiers of all houses rated at £15 a year or upwards. But it was proposed that these extensions should be accompanied by an educational fran-

chise, and a franchise conferred on persons who had paid twenty shillings in assessed taxes or income tax; the tax-payers who had gained a vote in this way being given a second vote in respect of the property which they occupied. In the course of the discussion on the bill in the house of commons, the securities on which its authors had relied to enable them to stem the tide of democracy were, chiefly through Mr. Gladstone's exertions, swept away. The dual vote was abandoned, direct payment of rates was surrendered, the county franchise was extended to £12 householders, and the redistribution of seats was largely increased. The bill, in the shape in which it had been introduced, had been surrounded with safeguards to property. With their loss it involved a great radical change, which placed the working classes of the country in the position of predominance which the middle classes had occupied since 1832.

DISRAELI PRIME MINISTER

The passage of the bill necessitated a dissolution of parliament; but it had to be postponed to enable parliament to supplement the English Reform Act of 1867 with measures applicable to Scotland and Ireland, and to give time for settling the boundaries of the new constituencies which had been created. This delay gave the conservatives another year of office. But the first place in the cabinet passed in 1868 from Lord Derby to his lieutenant, Mr. Disraeli. The change added interest to political life. Thenceforward, for the next thirteen years, the chief places in the two great parties in the state were filled by the two men, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, who were unquestionably the ablest representatives of their respective followers. But the situation was also remarkable because power thus definitely passed from men who, without exception, had been born in the eighteenth century, and had all held cabinet offices before 1832, to men who had been born in the nineteenth century, and had only risen to cabinet rank in the 'forties and the 'fifties. It was also interesting to reflect that Mr. Gladstone had begun life as a conservative, and had only gradually moved to the ranks of the liberal party; while Mr. Disraeli had fought his first election under the auspices of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Hume, had won his spurs by his attacks on Sir Robert Peel, and had been only reluctantly adopted by the conservatives as their leader in the house of commons.

The Irish Church

The struggle commenced in 1868 on an Irish question. During the previous years considerable attention had been paid to a secret conspiracy in Ireland and among the Irish in America. The Fenians, as they were called, actually attempted insurrection in Ireland, and an invasion of Canada from the United States. At the beginning of 1866 Lord Russell's government thought itself compelled to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland; and in 1867 Lord Derby's government was confronted in the spring by a plot to seize Chester Castle, and in the autumn by an attack on a prison van at Manchester containing Fenian prisoners, and by an atrocious attempt to blow up Clerkenwell Prison. Conservative politicians deduced from these circumstances the necessity of applying firm government to Ireland. Liberal statesmen, on the contrary, desired to extirpate rebellion by remedying the grievances of which Ireland still complained. Chief among these was the fact that the Established Church in Ireland was the church of only a minority of the Irish people. In March, 1868, Mr. Maguire, an Irish Roman Catholic, asked the house of commons to resolve itself into a committee to take into immediate considera-

[1868-1869 A. D.]

tion the affairs of Ireland. Mr. Gladstone, in the course of the debate, declared that in his opinion the time had come when the Irish Church, as a political institution, should cease; and he followed up his declaration by a series of resolutions, which were accepted by considerable majorities, pledging the house to its disestablishment. Mr. Disraeli, recognising the full significance of this decision, announced that, as soon as the necessary preparations could be made, the government would appeal from the house to the country. Parliament was dissolved at the end of July, but the general election did not take place till the end of the following November. The future of the Irish Church naturally formed one of the chief subjects which occupied the attention of the electors, but the issue was largely determined by wider considerations. The country, after the long political truce which had been maintained by Lord Palmerston, was again ranged in two hostile camps, animated by opposing views. It was virtually asked to decide in 1868 whether it would put its trust in liberal or conservative, in Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Disraeli. By an overwhelming majority it threw its lot in favour of Mr. Gladstone; and Mr. Disraeli, without even venturing to meet parliament, took the unusual course of at once placing his resignation in the queen's hands.

Abyssinian War

The conservative government, which thus fell, will be chiefly recollected for its remarkable concession to democratic principles by the passage of the Reform Act of 1867; but it deserves perhaps a word of praise for its conduct of a distant and unusual war. The emperor of Abyssinia had, for some time, detained some Englishmen prisoners in his country; and the government, unable to obtain redress in other ways, decided on sending an army to release them. The expedition, intrusted to Sir Robert Napier, afterwards Lord Napier of Magdala, was fitted out at great expense, and was rewarded with complete success. The prisoners were released, and the Abyssinian monarch committed suicide. Mr. Disraeli—whose oriental imagination was excited by the triumph—incurred some ridicule by his bombastic declaration that “the standard of St. George was hoisted upon the mountains of Rasselas.” But the ministry could at least claim that the war had been waged to rescue Englishmen from captivity, that it had been conducted with skill, and that it had accomplished its results. The events of the Abyssinian War, however, were forgotten in the great political revolution which had swept the conservatives from office and placed Mr. Gladstone in power. His government was destined to endure for more than five years. During that period it experienced the alternate prosperity and decline which nearly forty years before had been the lot of the whigs after the passage of the first Reform Act. During its first two sessions it accomplished greater changes in legislation than had been attempted by any ministry since that of Lord Grey. In its three last sessions it was destined to sink into gradual disrepute; and it was ultimately swept away by a wave of popular reaction as remarkable as that which had borne it into power.

GLADSTONE'S FIRST MINISTRY

It was generally understood that Mr. Gladstone intended to deal with three great Irish grievances—“the three branches of the upas tree”—the religious, agricultural, and educational grievances. The session of 1869 was devoted to the first of these subjects. Mr. Gladstone introduced a bill disconnecting the Irish Church from the state, establishing a synod for its gov-

[1800-1870 A.D.]

ernment, and—after leaving it in possession of its churches and its parsonages, and making ample provision for the life-interests of its existing clergy—devoting the bulk of its property to the relief of distress in Ireland. The bill was carried by large majorities through the house of commons; and the feeling of the country was so strong that the lords did not venture on its rejection. They satisfied themselves with engrafting on it a series of amendments which, on the whole, secured rather more liberal terms of compensation for existing interests. Some of these amendments were adopted by Mr. Gladstone; a compromise was effected in respect of the others; and the bill, which



WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE
(1809-1898)

had practically occupied the whole session, and had perhaps involved higher constructive skill than any measure passed in the previous half-century, became law. Having dealt with the Irish Church in 1869, Mr. Gladstone turned to the more complicated question of Irish land. So far back as the 'forties Sir R. Peel had appointed a commission, known from its chairman as the Devon Commission, which had recommended that the Irish tenant, in the event of disturbance, should receive some compensation for certain specified improvements which he had made in his holding. Parliament neglected to give effect to these recommendations; in a country where agriculture was the chief or almost only occupation the tenant remained at his landlord's mercy. In 1870 Mr. Gladstone proposed to give the tenant a pecuniary

interest in improvements, suitable to the holding, which he had made either before or after the passing of the act. He proposed also that, in cases of eviction, the smaller tenantry should receive compensation for disturbance. The larger tenantry, who were supposed to be able to look after their own interests, were entirely debarred, and tenants enjoying leases were excluded from claiming compensation except for tillages, buildings, and reclamation of lands. A special court, it was further provided, should be instituted to carry out the provisions of the bill. Large and radical as the measure was, reversing many of the accepted principles of legislation by giving the tenant a *quasi*-partnership with the landlord in his holding, no serious opposition was made to it in either house of parliament. Its details, indeed, were abundantly criticised, but its principles were hardly disputed, and it became law without any substantial alteration of its original provisions. In two sessions two branches of the upas tree had been summarily cut off. But parliament in 1870 was not solely occupied with the wrongs of Irish tenantry.

Elementary Education

In the same year Mr. Forster, as vice-president of the council, succeeded in carrying the great measure which for the first time made education compulsory. In devising his scheme, Mr. Forster endeavoured to utilise, as far as

[1870-1871 A.D.]

possible, the educational machinery which had been voluntarily provided by various religious organisations. He gave the institutions which had been thus established the full benefit of the assistance which the government was prepared to afford to board schools, on their adopting a conscience clause under which the religious susceptibilities of the parents of children were protected. This provision led to many debates, and produced the first symptoms of disruption in the liberal party. The nonconformists contended that no such aid should be given to any school which was not conducted on undenominational principles. Supported by the bulk of the conservative party, Mr. Forster was enabled to defeat the dissenters. But the victory which he secured was, in one sense, dearly purchased. The first breach in the liberal ranks had been made; and the government, after 1870, never again commanded the same united support which had enabled it to pursue its victorious career in the first two sessions of its existence.

Black Sea Neutrality; Army Purchase

Towards the close of the session of 1870 other events, for which the government had no direct responsibility, introduced new difficulties. War unexpectedly broke out between France and Prussia. The French Empire fell; the German armies marched on Paris; and the Russian government, at Count Bismarck's instigation, took advantage of the collapse of France to repudiate the clause in the treaty of 1856 which neutralised the Black Sea. Lord Granville, who had succeeded Lord Clarendon at the foreign office, protested against this proceeding. But it was everywhere felt that his mere protest was not likely to affect the result; and the government at last consented to accept a suggestion made by Count Bismarck, and to take part in a conference to discuss the Russian proposal. Though this device enabled them to say that they had not yielded to the Russian demand, it was obvious that they entered the conference with the foregone conclusion of conceding the Russian claim. The attitude which the government thus chose to adopt was perhaps inevitable in the circumstances, but it confirmed the impression, which the abandonment of the cause of Denmark had produced in 1864, that Great Britain was not prepared to maintain its principles by going to war. The weakness of the British foreign office was emphasised by its consenting, almost at the same moment, to allow the claims of the United States, for the depredations of the *Alabama*, to be settled under a rule only agreed upon in 1871. Most Englishmen now appreciate the wisdom of a concession which has gained for them the friendship of the United States.



EARL OF BEACONSFIELD
(1804-1881)

But in 1871 the country resented the manner in which Lord Granville had acted.

Whatever credit the government might have derived from its domestic measures, it was discredited, or it was thought to be, by its foreign policy. In these circumstances legislation in 1871 was not marked with the success which had attended the government in previous sessions. The government succeeded in terminating a long controversy by abolishing ecclesiastical tests at universities. But the lords ventured to reject a measure for the introduction of the ballot at elections, and refused to proceed with a bill for the abolition of purchase in the army. The result of these decisions was indeed remarkable. In the one case, the lords in 1872 found it necessary to give way, and to pass the Ballot Bill, which they had rejected in 1871. In the other, Mr. Gladstone decided on abolishing, by the direct authority of the crown, the system which the lords had refused to do away with by legislation. But his high-handed proceeding, though it forced the lords to reconsider their decision, strained the allegiance of many of his supporters, and still further impaired the popularity of his administration. Most men felt that it would have been permissible for him at the commencement of the session to have used the queen's authority to terminate the purchase system; but they considered that, as he had not taken this course, it was not open to him to reverse the decision of the legislature by resorting to the prerogative. Two appointments, one to a judicial office, the other to an ecclesiastical preferment, in which Mr. Gladstone, about the same time, showed more disposition to obey the letter than the spirit of the law, confirmed the impression which the abolition of purchase had made. Great reforming ministers would do well to recollect that the success of even liberal measures may be dearly purchased by the resort to what are regarded as unconstitutional expedients.

Governmental Embarrassments

In the following years the embarrassments of the government were further increased. In 1872 Mr. Bruce, the home secretary, succeeded in passing a measure of licensing reform. But the abstainers condemned the bill as inadequate; the publicans denounced it as oppressive; and the whole strength of the licensed victuallers was thenceforward arrayed against the ministry. In 1873 Mr. Gladstone attempted to complete his great Irish measures by conferring on Ireland the advantage of a university which would be equally acceptable to Protestants and Roman Catholics. But his proposal again failed to satisfy those in whose interests it was proposed. The second reading of the bill was rejected by a small majority, and Mr. Gladstone resigned; but, as Mr. Disraeli could not form a government, he resumed office. The power of the great minister was, however, spent; his ministry was hopelessly discredited. History, in fact, was repeating itself. The ministry was suffering, as Lord Grey's government had suffered nearly forty years before, from the effect of its own successes. It had accomplished more than any of its supporters had expected, but in doing so it had harassed many interests and excited much opposition. Mr. Gladstone endeavoured to meet the storm by a rearrangement of his crew. Mr. Bruce, who had offended the licensed victuallers, was removed from the home office, and made a peer and president of the council. Mr. Lowe, who had incurred unpopularity by his fiscal measures, and especially by an abortive suggestion for the taxation of matches, was transferred from the exchequer to the home office, and Mr. Gladstone himself assumed the duties of chancellor of the exchequer. He thereby

[1873-1876 A.D.]

created a difficulty for himself which he had not foreseen. Up to 1867 a minister leaving one office and accepting another vacated his seat; after 1867 a transfer from one post to another did not necessitate a fresh election. But Mr. Gladstone in 1873 had taken a course which had not been contemplated in 1867. He had not been transferred from one office to another. He had accepted a new in addition to his old office. It was, to say the least, uncertain whether his action in this respect had or had not vacated his seat. It would be unfair to suggest that the inconvenient difficulty with which he was thus confronted determined his policy, though he was probably insensibly influenced by it. However this may be, on the eve of the session of 1874 he suddenly decided to dissolve parliament and to appeal to the country. He announced his decision in an address to his constituents, in which, among other financial reforms, he promised to repeal the income tax. The course which Mr. Gladstone took, and the bait which he held out to the electors, were generally condemned. The country, wearied of the ministry and of its measures, almost everywhere supported the conservative candidates. Mr. Disraeli found himself restored to power at the head of an overwhelming majority, and the great minister who, five years before, had achieved so marked a triumph temporarily withdrew from the leadership of the party with whose aid he had accomplished such important results. His ministry had been essentially one of peace, yet its closing days were memorable for one little war in which a great soldier increased a reputation already high. Sir Garnet Wolseley triumphed over the difficulties which the climate of the west coast of Africa imposes on Europeans, and brought a troublesome contest with the Ashantees to a successful conclusion.

DISRAELI'S SECOND MINISTRY

The history of Mr. Disraeli's second administration affords an exact reverse to that of Mr. Gladstone's first cabinet. In legislation the ministry attempted little and accomplished less. They did something to meet the wishes of the publicans, whose discontent had contributed largely to Mr. Gladstone's defeat, by amending some of the provisions of Mr. Bruce's Licensing Bill; they supported and succeeded in passing a measure, brought in by the primate, to restrain some of the irregularities which the ritualists were introducing into public worship; and they were compelled by the violent insistence of Mr. Plimsoll to pass an act to protect the lives of merchant seamen. Mr. Disraeli's government, however, will be chiefly remembered for its foreign policy. Years before he had propounded in *Tancred* the theory that England should aim at eastern empire. Circumstances in his second term of office enabled him to translate his theory into practice. In 1875 the country was suddenly startled at hearing that it had acquired a new position and assumed new responsibilities in Egypt by the purchase of the shares which the khedive of Egypt held in the Suez Canal. In the following spring a new surprise was afforded by the introduction of a measure authorising the queen to assume the title Empress of India.

"Bulgarian Atrocities"

But these significant actions were almost forgotten in the presence of a new crisis; for in 1876 misgovernment in Turkey had produced its natural results, and the European provinces of the Porte were in a state of armed insurrection. In the presence of a grave danger, Count Andrassy, the Aus-

trian minister, drew up a note which was afterwards known by his name, declaring that the Porte had failed to carry into effect the promises of reform which she had made, and that some combined action on the part of Europe was necessary to compel her to do so. The note was accepted by the three continental empires, but Great Britain refused in the first instance to assent to it, and only ultimately consented at the desire of the Porte, whose statesmen seem to have imagined that the nominal co-operation of England would have the effect of restraining the action of other powers. Turkey accepted the note and renewed the promises of reform which she had so often made, and which meant so little. The three northern powers thereupon agreed upon what was known as the Berlin Memorandum, in which they demanded an armistice, and proposed to watch over the completion of the reforms which the Porte had promised. The British government refused to be a party to this memorandum, which in consequence became abortive. The insurrection increased in intensity. The sultan Abdul Aziz, thought unequal to the crisis, was hastily deposed; he was either murdered or led to commit suicide; and insurrection in Bulgaria was stamped out by massacre. The story of the "Bulgarian atrocities" was published in Great Britain in the summer of 1876. Mr. Disraeli characteristically dismissed it as "coffee-house babble," but official investigation proved the substantial accuracy of the reports which had reached England. The people regarded these events with horror. Mr. Gladstone, emerging from his retirement, denounced the conduct of the Turks. In a phrase which became famous he declared that the only remedy for the European provinces of the Porte was to turn out the Ottoman government "bag and baggage."

All England was at once arrayed into two camps. One party was led by Mr. Disraeli, who was supposed to represent the traditional policy of England of maintaining the rule of the Turk at all hazards; the other, inspired by the example of Mr. Gladstone, was resolved at all costs to terminate oppression, but was at the same time distrusted as indirectly assisting the ambitious views by which the Eastern policy of Russia had always been animated. The crisis soon became intense. In June, 1876, Serbia and Montenegro declared war against Turkey. In a few months Serbia was hopelessly beaten. Through the insistence of Russia an armistice was agreed upon; and Lord Beaconsfield—for Mr. Disraeli had now been raised to the peerage—endeavoured to utilise the breathing space by organising a conference of the great powers at Constantinople, which was attended on behalf of Great Britain by Lord Salisbury. The Constantinople Conference proved abortive, and in the beginning of 1877 Russia declared war. For some time, however, her success was hardly equal to her expectations. The Turks, intrenched at Plevna, delayed the Russian advance; and it was only towards the close of 1877 that Plevna at last fell and Turkish resistance collapsed. With its downfall the war party in England, which was led by the prime minister, increased in violence. From the refrain of a song, sung night after night at a London music hall, its members became known as Jingoists. The government ordered the British fleet to pass the Dardanelles and go up to Constantinople; and though the order was subsequently withdrawn, it asked for and obtained a grant of £6,000,000 for naval and military purposes. When news came that the Russian armies had reached Adrianople, that they had concluded some arrangement with the Turks, and that they were pressing forward towards Constantinople, the fleet was again directed to pass the Dardanelles. Soon afterwards the government decided to call out the reserves and to bring a contingent of Indian troops to the Mediterranean. Lord Derby, who was at

[1878-1879 A.D.]

the foreign office, thereupon retired from the ministry, and was succeeded by Lord Salisbury. Lord Derby's resignation was everywhere regarded as a proof that Great Britain was on the verge of war.

Happily war did not occur. At Prince Bismarck's suggestion Russia consented to refer the treaty which she had concluded at San Stefano to a congress of the great powers; and the congress, at which Great Britain was represented by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, succeeded in substituting for the Treaty of San Stefano the Treaty of Berlin. The one great advantage derived from it was the tacit acknowledgment by Russia that Europe could alone alter arrangements which Europe had made. In every other sense it is doubtful whether the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin were more favourable than those of the Treaty of San Stefano. On Lord Beaconsfield's return, however, he claimed for Lord Salisbury and himself that they had brought back "peace with honour," and the country accepted with wild delight the phrase, without taking much trouble to analyse its justice.

Afghan Wars

If Lord Beaconsfield had dissolved parliament immediately after his return from Berlin, it is possible that the wave of popularity which had been raised by his success would have borne him forward to a fresh victory in the constituencies. His omission to do so gave the country time to meditate on the consequences of his policy. One result soon became perceptible. Differences with Russia produced their inevitable consequences in fresh complications on the Indian frontier. The Russian government, confronted with a quarrel with Great Britain in eastern Europe, endeavoured to create difficulties in Afghanistan. A Russian envoy was sent to Kabul, where Shere Ali, who had been placed on the throne after the war of 1841, was still reigning; and the British government, alarmed at this new embarrassment, decided on sending a mission to the Afghan capital. The mission was stopped on the frontier by an agent of Shere Ali, who declined to allow it to proceed. The British government refused to put up with an affront of this kind, and their envoy, supported by an army, continued his advance. Afghanistan was again invaded. Kabul and Kandahar were occupied; and Shere Ali was forced to fly, and soon afterwards died. His successor, Yakoob Khan, came to the British camp and signed, in May, 1879, the Treaty of Gandamak. Under the terms of this treaty the Indian government undertook to pay the new Ameer a subsidy of £60,000 a year; and Yakoob Khan consented to receive a British mission at Kabul, and to cede some territory in the Himalayas which the military advisers of Lord Beaconsfield considered necessary to make the frontier more "scientific." This apparent success was soon followed by disastrous news. The deplorable events of 1841 were re-enacted in 1879. The new envoy reached Kabul, but was soon afterwards murdered. A British army was again sent into Afghanistan, and Kabul was again occupied. Yakoob Khan, who had been made ameer in 1879, was deposed, and Abdurrahman Khan was selected as his successor. The British did not assert their superiority without much fighting and some serious reverses. Their victory was at last assured by the excellent strategy of Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Frederick (afterwards Lord) Roberts. But before the final victory was gained Lord Beaconsfield had fallen. His policy had brought Great Britain to the verge of disaster in Afghanistan; the credit of reasserting the superiority of British arms was deferred till his successors had taken office.

It was not only in Afghanistan that the new imperial policy which Lord Beaconsfield had done so much to encourage was straining the resources of the empire. In South Africa a still more serious difficulty was already commencing. At the time at which Lord Beaconsfield's administration began, British territory in South Africa was practically confined to Cape Colony and Natal. Years before, in 1852, the British government, at that time a little weary of the responsibilities of colonial rule, had recognised the independence of the two Dutch republics, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Powerful native tribes occupied the territory to the north of Natal and the east of the Transvaal. War broke out between the Transvaal Republic and one of the most powerful of these native chieftains, Secoceni; and the Transvaal was worsted in the struggle. Alarmed at the possible consequences of this defeat, and conscious of their inability to carry on the struggle, a party in the Transvaal openly recommended the annexation of the country to British territory. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who was sent to inquire into the proposal, mistook the opinion of a party for the verdict of the republic, and declared the Transvaal a part of the British Empire.

Zulu War

His policy entailed far more serious consequences than the mission to Afghanistan. The first was a war with the Zulus, the most powerful and warlike of the native African tribes, who under their ruler, Cetewayo, had organised a formidable army. A dispute had been going on for some time about the possession of a strip of territory which some British arbitrators had awarded to the Zulu king. Sir Bartle Frere, who had won distinction in India, and was sent out by Lord Beaconsfield's government to the Cape, kept back the award; and, though he ultimately communicated it to Cetewayo, thought it desirable to demand the disbandment of the Zulu army. In the war which ensued, the British troops who invaded Zulu territory met with a severe reverse; and, though the disaster was ultimately retrieved by Lord Chelmsford and Sir Garnet Wolseley, the war involved heavy expenditure and brought little credit to the British army, while one unfortunate incident, the death of Prince Napoleon, who had obtained leave to serve with the British troops, and was surprised by the Zulus while reconnoitring, created a deep and unfortunate impression. Imperialism, which had been excited by Lord Beaconsfield's policy in 1878, and by the prospect of a war with a great European power, fell into discredit when it degenerated into a fresh expedition into Afghanistan, and an inglorious war with a savage African tribe. A period of distress at home increased the discontent which Lord Beaconsfield's external policy was exciting; and, when parliament was at last dissolved in 1880, it seemed no longer certain that the country would indorse the policy of the minister who only a short time before had acquired such popularity. Mr. Gladstone, emerging from his retirement, practically placed himself again at the head of the liberal party. In a series of speeches in Midlothian, where he offered himself for election, he denounced the whole policy which Lord Beaconsfield had pursued. His impassioned eloquence did much more than influence his own election. His speeches decided the contest throughout the kingdom. The liberals secured an even more surprising success than that which had rewarded the conservatives six years before. For the first time in the queen's reign a solid liberal majority, independent of all extraneous Irish support, was returned, and Mr. Gladstone resumed in triumph his old position as prime minister.

[1880-1881 A.D.]

GLADSTONE'S SECOND MINISTRY; BOER WAR OF 1881

The new minister had been swept into power on a wave of popular favour, but he inherited difficulties from his predecessors in almost every quarter of the world; and his own language had perhaps tended to increase them. He was committed to a reversal of Lord Beaconsfield's policy; and, in politics it is never easy, and perhaps rarely wise, suddenly and violently to change a system. In one quarter of the world the new minister achieved much success. The war in Afghanistan, which had begun with disaster, was creditably concluded. A better understanding was gradually established with Russia; and, before the ministry went out, steps had been taken which led to the delimitation of the Russian and Afghan frontier. In South Africa, however, a very different result ensued. Mr. Gladstone, before he accepted office, had denounced the policy of annexing the Transvaal; his language was so strong that he was charged with encouraging the Boers to maintain their independence by force; his example had naturally been imitated by some of his followers at the general election; and, when he resumed power, he found himself in the difficult dilemma of either maintaining an arrangement which he had declared to be unwise, or of yielding to a demand which the Boers were already threatening to support in arms.

The events of the first year of his administration added to his difficulty. Before its close the Boers seized Heidelberg and established a republic; they destroyed a detachment of British troops at Bronker's Spruit; they treacherously murdered a British officer; and they surrounded and attacked the British garrisons in the Transvaal. Troops were of course sent from England to maintain the British cause; and Sir George Colley, who enjoyed a high reputation and had experience in South African warfare, was made governor of Natal, and intrusted with the military command. The events which immediately followed will not be easily forgotten. Wholly miscalculating the strength of the Boers Sir George Colley, at the end of January, 1881, attacked them at Laing's Nek, in the north of Natal, and was repulsed with heavy loss. Some ten days afterwards he fought another action on the Ingogo, and was again forced to retire. On the 26th February, with some 600 men, he occupied a high hill, known as Majuba, which, he thought, dominated the Boer position. The following day the Boers attacked the hill, overwhelmed its defenders, and Sir George Colley was himself killed in the disastrous contest on the summit. News of these occurrences was received with dismay in England. It was, no doubt, possible to say a good deal for Mr. Gladstone's indignant denunciation of his predecessor's policy in annexing the Transvaal; it would have been equally possible to advance many reasons for reversing the measures of Lord Beaconsfield's cabinet, and for conceding independence to the Transvaal in 1880. But the great majority of persons considered that, whatever arguments might have been urged for concession in 1880, when British troops had suffered no reverses, nothing could be said for concession in 1881, when their arms had been tarnished by a humiliating disaster. Great countries can afford to be generous in the hour of victory; but they cannot yield, without loss of credit, in the hour of defeat. Unfortunately this reasoning was not suited to Mr. Gladstone's temperament. The justice or injustice of the British cause seemed to him a much more important matter than the vindication of military honour; and he could not bring himself to acknowledge that Majuba had altered the situation, and that the terms which he had made up his mind to concede before the battle could not be safely granted till military reputation was restored.

[1880-1886 A.D.]

The independence of the Transvaal was accordingly recognised,¹ though it was provided that the republic should remain under the suzerainty of the queen. Even this great concession did not satisfy the ambition of the Boers, who were naturally elated by their victories. Three years later some Transvaal deputies, with their president, Kruger, came to London and saw Lord Derby, the secretary of state for the colonies. Lord Derby consented to a new convention, from which any verbal reference to suzerainty was excluded; and the South African Republic was made independent, subject only to the condition that it should conclude no treaties with foreign powers without the approval of the crown.

The Bradlaugh Question

Mr. Gladstone's government declined in popularity from the date of the earliest of these concessions. Mr. Gladstone, in fact, had succeeded in doing what Lord Beaconsfield had failed to accomplish. Annoyance at his foreign policy had rekindled the imperialism which the embarrassments created by Lord Beaconsfield had done so much to damp down. And, if things were going badly with the new government abroad, matters were not progressing smoothly at home. At the general election of 1880, the borough of Northampton, which of late years has shown an unwavering preference for liberals of an advanced type, returned as its members Mr. Henry Labouchere and Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. Bradlaugh, who had attained some notoriety for an aggressive atheism, claimed the right to make an affirmation of allegiance instead of taking the customary oath, which he declared was, in his eyes, a meaningless form. The speaker, instead of deciding the question, submitted it to the judgment of the house, and it was ultimately referred to a select committee, which reported against Mr. Bradlaugh's claim. Mr. Bradlaugh, on hearing the decision of the committee, presented himself at the bar and offered to take the oath. It was objected that, as he had publicly declared that the words of the oath had no clear meaning for him, he could not be permitted to take it; and after some wrangling the matter was referred to a fresh committee, which supported the view that Mr. Bradlaugh could not be allowed to be sworn, but recommended that he should be permitted to make the affirmation at his own risk.

The house refused to accept the recommendation of this committee when a bill was introduced to give effect to it. This decision naturally enlarged the question before it. For, while hitherto the debate had turned on the technical points whether an affirmation could be substituted for an oath, or whether a person who had declared that an oath had no meaning for him could properly be sworn, the end at which Mr. Bradlaugh's opponents were thenceforward aiming was the imposition of a new religious test—the belief in a God—on members of the house of commons. The controversy which thus began continued through the parliament of 1880, and led to many violent scenes, which lowered the dignity of the house. It was quietly terminated, in the Parliament of 1886, by the firm action of a new speaker. Mr. Peel, who had been elected to the chair, decided that neither the speaker nor any other member had the right to intervene to prevent a member from taking the oath if he was willing to take it. Parliament subsequently, by a new act, permitted affirmations to be used, and thenceforward religion, or the absence of religion, was no disqualification for a seat in the house of commons. The atheist, like the Roman Catholic and the Jew, could sit and vote.

[¹ Great Britain first proposed to retain certain districts, but yielded to threats of renewed hostilities.]

[1880-1882 A.D.]

Parnell

The Bradlaugh question was not the only difficulty with which the new government was confronted. Ireland was again attracting the attention of politicians. The Fenian movement had practically expired; some annual motions for the introduction of Home Rule, made with all the decorum of parliamentary usage, had been regularly defeated. But the Irish were placing themselves under new leaders and adopting new methods. During the conservative government of 1874, the Irish members had endeavoured to arrest attention by organised obstruction. Their efforts had increased the difficulties of government and taxed the endurance of parliament. These tactics were destined to be raised to a fine art by Mr. Parnell, who succeeded to the head of the Irish party about the time of the formation of Mr. Gladstone's government. It was Mr. Parnell's determination to make legislation impracticable and parliament unendurable till Irish grievances were redressed. It was his evident belief that by pursuing such tactics he could force the house of commons to concede the legislation which he desired. The Irish members were not satisfied with the legislation which parliament had passed in 1869-1870. The Land Act of 1870 had given the tenant no security in the case of eviction for non-payment of rent; and the tenant whose rent was too high or had been raised was at the mercy of his landlord. It so happened that some bad harvests had temporarily increased the difficulties of the tenantry, and there was no doubt that large numbers of evictions were taking place in Ireland. In these circumstances the Irish contended that the relief which the act of 1870 had afforded should be extended, and that, till such legislation could be devised, a temporary measure should be passed giving the tenant compensation for disturbance. Mr. Gladstone admitted the force of this reasoning, and a bill was introduced to give effect to it. Passed by the commons, it was thrown out towards the end of the session by the lords; and the government acquiesced—perhaps could do nothing but acquiesce—in this decision. In Ireland, however, the rejection of the measure was attended with disastrous results. Outrages increased, obnoxious landlords and agents were "boycotted"—the name of the first gentleman exposed to this treatment adding a new word to the language; and Mr. Forster, who had accepted the office of chief secretary, thought it necessary, in the presence of outrage and intimidation, to adopt stringent measures for enforcing order. A measure was passed on his initiation, in 1881, authorising him to arrest and detain suspected persons; and many well-known Irishmen, including Mr. Parnell himself and other members of parliament, were thrown into prison.

It was an odd commentary on parliamentary government that a liberal ministry should be in power, and that Irish members should be in prison; and early in 1882 Mr. Gladstone determined to liberate the prisoners on terms. The new policy—represented by what was known as the Kilmainham Treaty—led to the resignation of the viceroy, Lord Cowper, and of Mr. Forster, and the appointment of Lord Spencer and Lord Frederick Cavendish as their successors. On the 6th of May, 1882, Lord Spencer made his entry into Dublin, and on the evening of the same day Lord Frederick, unwisely allowed to walk home alone with Mr. Burke, the under-secretary to the Irish government, was murdered with his companion in Phoenix Park. This gross outrage led to fresh measures of coercion. The disclosure, soon afterwards, of a conspiracy to resort to dynamite still further alienated the sympathies of the

liberal party from the Irish nation. Mr. Gladstone might fairly plead that he had done much, that he had risked much, for Ireland, and that Ireland was making him a poor return for his services.

Egypt: the Death of Gordon

In the mean while another difficulty was further embarrassing a harassed government. The necessities of the khedive of Egypt had been only temporarily relieved by the sale to Lord Beaconsfield's government of the Suez Canal shares. Egyptian finance, in the interests of the bondholders, had been placed under the dual control of England and France. The new arrangement naturally produced some native resentment, and Arabi Pasha placed himself at the head of a movement which was intended to rid Egypt of foreign interference. His preparations eventually led to the bombardment of Alexandria by the British fleet, and still later to the invasion of Egypt by a British army under Sir Garnet, afterwards Lord Wolseley, and to the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, after which Arabi was defeated and taken prisoner. The bombardment of Alexandria led to the immediate resignation of Mr. Bright, whose presence in the cabinet had been of importance to the government; the occupation of Egypt broke up the dual control, and made Great Britain responsible for Egyptian administration. The effects of British rule were, in one sense, remarkable. The introduction of good government increased the prosperity of the people, and restored confidence in Egyptian finance. At the same time it provoked the animosity of the French, who were naturally jealous of the increase of British influence on the Nile, and it also threw new responsibilities on the British nation. For, south of Egypt, lay the great territory of the Sudan, which to some extent commands the Nile, and which with Sir Samuel Baker's assistance had been conquered by the khedive. In 1881 a fanatic sheikh—known as the Mahdi—had headed an insurrection against the khedive's authority; and towards the close of 1883 an Egyptian army under an Englishman, Colonel Hicks, was almost annihilated by the insurgent soldiery. The insurrection increased the responsibilities which intervention had imposed on England, and an expedition was sent to Suakin to guard the littoral of the Red Sea; while, at the beginning of 1884, General Gordon—whose services in China had gained him a high reputation, and who had previous experience in the Sudan—was sent to Khartum to report on the condition of affairs.

These decisions led to momentous results. The British expedition to Suakin was engaged in a series of battles with Osman Digna, the Mahdi's lieutenant; while General Gordon, after alternate reverses and successes, was isolated at Khartum. Anxious as Mr. Gladstone's ministry was to restrict the sphere of its responsibilities, it was compelled to send an expedition to relieve General Gordon; and at the close of 1884 Lord Wolseley, who was appointed to the command, decided on moving up the Nile to his relief. The expedition proved much more difficult than Lord Wolseley had anticipated. And, before it reached its goal, Khartum was forced to surrender, and General Gordon and his few faithful followers were murdered. General Gordon's death inflicted a fatal blow on the liberal government. It was thought that the general, whose singular devotion to duty made him a popular hero, had been allowed to assume an impossible task; had been feebly supported; and that the measures for his relief had been unduly postponed and at last only reluctantly undertaken. The ministry ultimately experienced defeat on a side issue. The budget, which Mr. Childers brought forward as chancellor of the

[1885-1886 A.D.]

exchequer, was attacked by the conservative party; and an amendment proposed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, condemning an increase in the duties on spirits and beer, was adopted by a small majority. Mr. Gladstone resigned office, and Lord Salisbury, who, after Lord Beaconsfield's death, had succeeded to the lead of the conservative party, was instructed to form a new administration.

LORD SALISBURY'S MINISTRY

It was obvious that the new government, as its first duty, would be compelled to dissolve the parliament that had been elected when Mr. Gladstone was enjoying the popularity which he had lost so rapidly in office. But it so happened that it was no longer possible to appeal to the old constituencies. For, in 1884, Mr. Gladstone had introduced a new Reform bill; and, though its passage had been arrested by the lords, unofficial communications between the leaders of both parties had resulted in a compromise which had led to the adoption of a large and comprehensive Reform Act. By this measure, household franchise was extended to the counties. But counties and boroughs were broken up into a number of small constituencies, for the most part returning only one member each; while the necessity of increasing the relative weight of Great Britain, and the reluctance to inflict disfranchisement on Ireland, led to an increase in the numbers of the house of commons from 658 to 670 members. This radical reconstruction of the electorate necessarily made the result of the elections doubtful. As a matter of fact, the new parliament comprised 334 liberals, 250 conservatives, and 86 Irish nationalists. It was plain beyond the possibility of doubt that the future depended on the course which the Irish nationalists might adopt. If they threw in their lot with Mr. Gladstone, Lord Salisbury's government was evidently doomed. If, on the contrary, they joined the conservatives, they could make a liberal administration impracticable.

In the autumn of 1885 it was doubtful what course the Irish nationalists would take. It was generally understood that Lord Carnarvon, who had been made Viceroy of Ireland, had been in communication with Mr. Parnell; that Lord Salisbury was aware of the interviews which had taken place; and it was whispered that Lord Carnarvon was in favour of granting some sort of administrative autonomy to Ireland. Whatever opinion Lord Carnarvon may have formed—and his precise view is certain—a greater man than he had suddenly arrived at a similar conclusion. In his election speeches Mr. Gladstone had insisted on the necessity of the country returning a liberal majority which could act independently on the Irish vote; and the result of the general election had left the Irish the virtual arbiters of the political situation. In these circumstances Mr. Gladstone arrived at a momentous decision. He recognised that the system under which Ireland had been governed in the past had failed to win the allegiance of her people; and he decided that it was wise and safe to entrust her with a large measure of self-government. It was perhaps characteristic of Mr. Gladstone, though it was unquestionably unfortunate, that, in determining on this radical change of policy, he consulted few, if any, of his previous colleagues. On the meeting of the new parliament Lord Salisbury's government was defeated on an amendment to the address, demanding facilities for agricultural labourers to obtain small holdings for gardens and pasture—the policy, in short, which was described as "Three acres and a cow."

[¹ This policy was vehemently attacked by Lord Salisbury in a speech, October 7th.]

GLADSTONE AGAIN IN POWER

Lord Salisbury resigned, and Mr. Gladstone resumed power. The attitude, however, which Mr. Gladstone was understood to be taking on the subject of Home Rule threw many difficulties in his way. Lord Hartington, and others of his former colleagues, declined to join his administration; Mr. Chamberlain, who, in the first instance, accepted office, retired almost immediately from the ministry; and Mr. Bright, whose eloquence and services gave him a unique position in the house, threw in his lot in opposition to Home Rule. A split in the liberal party thus began, which was destined to endure; and Mr. Gladstone found his difficulties increased by the defection of the men on whom he had hitherto largely relied. He persevered, however, in the task which he had set himself, and introduced a measure endowing Ireland with a parliament, and excluding the Irish members from Westminster. He was defeated, and appealed from the house which had refused to support him to the country. For the first time in the queen's reign, two general elections occurred within twelve months. The country showed no more disposition than the house of commons to approve the course which the minister was taking. A large majority of the members of the new parliament were pledged to resist Home Rule. Mr. Gladstone, bowing at once to the verdict of the people, resigned office, and Lord Salisbury returned to power.

THE NEW SALISBURY MINISTRY

The new cabinet, which was formed to resist Home Rule, did not succeed in combining all the opponents to this measure. The secessionists from the liberal party—the liberal unionists, as they were called—held aloof from it; and Lord Salisbury was forced to form his cabinet out of his immediate followers. The most picturesque appointment was that of Lord Randolph Churchill, who was made chancellor of the exchequer, and leader of the house of commons. But before many months were over, Lord Randolph—unable to secure acceptance of a policy of financial retrenchment—resigned office, and Lord Salisbury was forced to reconstruct his ministry. Though he again failed to obtain the co-operation of the liberal unionists, one of the more prominent of them—Mr. Goschen—accepted the seals of the exchequer. Mr. W. H. Smith moved from the war office to the treasury, and became leader of the house of commons; while Lord Salisbury himself returned to the foreign office, which the dramatically sudden death of Lord Iddesleigh, better known as Sir Stafford Northcote, vacated. These arrangements lasted till 1891, when, on Mr. Smith's death, the treasury and the lead of the commons were entrusted to Lord Salisbury's nephew, Mr. Arthur Balfour, who had made a great reputation as chief secretary for Ireland.

The ministry of 1886, which endured till 1892, gave to London a county council: introduced representative government into every English county; and made elementary education free throughout England. The alliance with the liberal unionists was, in fact, compelling the conservative government to promote measures which were not wholly consistent with the stricter conservative traditions or wishes. In other respects, the legislative achievements of the government were not great; and the time of parliament was largely occupied in devising rules for the conduct of its business, which the obstructive attitude of the Irish members made necessary, and in discussing the charges brought against the nationalist party by the *Times*, of complicity in

[1887-1892 A.D.]

the Phoenix Park murders. Under the new rules, the sittings of the house on ordinary days were made to commence at 3 P.M., and opposed business was automatically interrupted at midnight, while for the first time a power was given to the majority in a house of a certain size to conclude debate by what was known as the closure. Notwithstanding these new rules obstructive tactics continued to prevail; and, in the course of the parliament, many members were suspended for disorderly conduct.

The hostility of the Irish members was perhaps increased by some natural indignation at the charges brought against Mr. Parnell. The *Times*, in April, 1887, printed the facsimile of a letter purporting to be signed by Mr. Parnell, in which he declared that he had no other course open to him but to denounce the Phoenix Park murders, but that, while he regretted "the accident" of Lord Frederick Cavendish's death, he could not "refuse to admit that Burke got no more than his deserts." The publication of this letter, and later of other similar documents, naturally created a great sensation; and the government ultimately appointed a special commission of three judges to inquire into the charges and allegations that were made. In the course of the inquiry it was proved that the letters had emanated from a man named Pigott, who had at one time been associated with the Irish nationalist movement, but who for some time past had earned a precarious living by writing begging and threatening letters. Pigott, subjected to severe cross-examination by Sir Charles Russell (afterwards Lord Russell of Killowen), broke down, fled from justice, and committed suicide. His flight practically settled the question; and an inquiry, which many people had thought at its inception would brand Mr. Parnell as a criminal, raised him to an influence which he had never enjoyed before. But in the same year which witnessed his triumph, his fall was doomed. He was made co-respondent in a divorce suit brought by Captain O'Shea—another Irishman—for the dissolution of his marriage; and the disclosures made at the trial induced Mr. Gladstone, who was supported by the nonconformists generally throughout the United Kingdom, to request Mr. Parnell to withdraw from the leadership of the Irish party. Mr. Parnell refused to comply with this request, and the Irish party was shattered into fragments by his decision. Mr. Parnell himself did not long survive the disruption of the party which he had done so much to create. The exertions which he made to retrieve his waning influence proved too much for his strength, and in the autumn of 1891 he died suddenly at Brighton.

Mr. Parnell's death radically altered the political situation. At the general elections of 1885 and 1886 the existence of a strong, united Irish party had exercised a dominating influence. As the parliament of 1886 was drawing to a close, the dissensions among the Irish members, and the loss of their great leader, were visibly sapping the strength of the nationalists. At the general election of 1892, Home Rule was still the prominent subject before the electors. But the English liberals were already a little weary of allies who were quarrelling among themselves, and whose disputes were introducing a new factor into politics. The political struggle virtually turned not on measures but on men. Mr. Gladstone's great age, and the marvellous powers which he displayed at a time when most men seek the repose of retirement, were the chief causes which affected the results. His influence enabled him to secure a small liberal majority. But it was noticed that the majority depended on Scottish, Irish, and Welsh votes, and that England—the "predominant partner," as it was subsequently called by Lord Rosebery—returned a majority of members pledged to resist any attempt to dissolve the union between the three kingdoms.

GLADSTONE AND THE HOME RULE BILL OF 1893 A.D.

On the meeting of the new parliament Lord Salisbury's government was defeated on a vote of want of confidence, and for a fourth time Mr. Gladstone became prime minister. In the session of 1893 he again introduced a Home Rule bill. But the measure of 1893 differed in many respects from that of 1886. In particular, the Irish were no longer to be excluded from the imperial parliament at Westminster. The bill which was thus brought forward was actually passed by the commons. It was, however, rejected by the lords. The dissensions among the Irish themselves, the hostility which English constituencies were displaying to the proposal, emboldened the peers to arrive at this decision. Some doubt was felt as to the course which Mr. Gladstone would take in this crisis. Many persons thought that he should at once have appealed to the country, and have endeavoured to obtain a distinct mandate from the constituencies to introduce a new Home Rule bill. Other persons imagined that he should have followed the precedent which had been set by Lord Grey in 1831, and, after a short prorogation, have re-introduced his measure in a new session. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gladstone adopted neither of these courses. The government decided not to take up the gauntlet thrown down by the peers, but to proceed with the rest of their political programme. With this object an autumn and winter session was held, during which the Parish Councils Act, introduced by Mr. Fowler, was passed, after several important amendments which had been introduced into it by the house of lords had been reluctantly accepted by Mr. Gladstone. On the other hand an employers' liability bill, introduced by Mr. Asquith, the home secretary, was ultimately dropped by Mr. Gladstone after passing all stages in the house of commons, rather than that an amendment of the peers, allowing "contracting out," should be accepted. Before, however, the session had quite run out (3rd March, 1894), Mr. Gladstone, who had now completed his eighty-fourth year, laid down a load which his increasing years made it impossible for him to sustain.

LORD ROSEBERY

Gladstone was succeeded by Lord Rosebery, whose abilities and attainments had raised him to a high place in the liberal counsels. Lord Rosebery did not succeed in popularising the Home Rule proposal which Mr. Gladstone had failed to carry. He declared, indeed, that success was not attainable till England was converted to its expediency. He hinted that success would not even then be assured until something was done to reform the constitution of the house of lords. But if, on the one hand, he refused to introduce a new Home Rule bill, he hesitated, on the other, to court defeat by any attempt to reform the lords. His government, in these circumstances, while it failed to conciliate its opponents, excited no enthusiasm among its supporters. It was generally understood, moreover, that a large section of the liberal party resented Lord Rosebery's appointment to the first place in the ministry, and thought that the lead should have been conferred on Sir W. Harcourt. It was an open secret that these differences in the party were reflected in the cabinet, and that the relations between Lord Rosebery and Sir W. Harcourt were too strained to ensure either the harmonious working or the stability of the administration. In these circumstances the fall of the ministry was only a question of time. It occurred—as often happens in parliament—on a minor

[1895-1897 A.D.]

issue which no one had foreseen. Attention was drawn in the house of commons to the insufficient supply of cordite provided by the war office, and the house—notwithstanding the assurance of the war minister (Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman) that the supply was adequate—placed the government in a minority. Lord Rosebery resigned office, and Lord Salisbury for the third time became prime minister, the duke of Devonshire, Mr. Chamberlain, and other liberal unionists joining the government. The parliament of 1892 was dissolved, and a new parliament, in which the unionists obtained an overwhelming majority, was returned.

The government of 1892, which was successively led by Mr. Gladstone and Lord Rosebery, will, on the whole, be recollected for its failures. Yet it passed two measures which have exercised and are exercising a wide influence. The Parish Councils Act introduced electoral institutions into the government of every parish, and in 1894 Sir W. Harcourt, as chancellor of the exchequer, availed himself of the opportunity which a large addition to the navy invited, to reconstruct the death duties. He swept away in doing so many of the advantages which the owner of real estate and the life tenant of settled property had previously enjoyed, and drove home a principle which Mr. Goschen had tentatively introduced a few years before by increasing the rate of the duty with the amount of the estate. Rich men, out of their superfluities, were thenceforward to pay more than poor men out of their necessities.

LORD SALISBURY; THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE

It is difficult to recapitulate the history of unionist government of 1895, which (with minor changes) was still in office in 1901. History may hereafter conclude that the most significant circumstance of the period is to be found in the demonstrations of loyalty and affection to which the sixtieth anniversary of Queen Victoria's accession led in 1897. Ten years before, her jubilee had been the occasion of enthusiastic rejoicings, and the queen's progress through London to a service of thanksgiving at Westminster had impressed the imagination of her subjects and proved the affection of her people. But the rejoicings of 1887 were forgotten amid the more striking demonstrations ten years later. It was seen that the queen, by her conduct and character, had gained a popularity which has had no parallel in history, and had won a place in the hearts of her subjects which perhaps no other monarch had ever previously enjoyed. There was no doubt that, if the opinion of the English-speaking races throughout the world could have been tested by a plebiscite, an overwhelming majority would have declared that the fittest person for the rule of the British Empire was the gracious and kindly lady who for sixty years, in sorrow and in joy, had so worthily discharged the duties of her high position. This remarkable demonstration was not confined to the British Empire alone. In every portion of the globe the sixtieth anniversary of the queen's reign excited interest; in every country the queen's name was mentioned with affection and respect; while the people of the United States vied with the subjects of the British Empire in praise of the queen's character and in expressions of regard for her person. Only a year or two before, an obscure dispute on the boundary of British Venezuela had brought the United States and Great Britain within sight of a quarrel. The jubilee showed conclusively that, whatever politicians might say, the ties of blood and kinship, which united the two peoples, were too close to be severed by either for some trifling cause; that the wisest heads in both nations were aware of the advantages which must arise from the closer union of the Anglo-Saxon races; and that

the true interests of both countries lay in their mutual friendship. A war in which the United States was subsequently engaged with Spain cemented this feeling. The government and the people of the United States recognised the advantage which they derived from the goodwill of Great Britain in the hour of their necessity, and the two nations, drew together as no other two nations had perhaps ever been drawn together in the history of the world.

If the jubilee was a proof of the closer union of the many sections of the British empire, and of their warm attachment to their sovereign, it also gave expression to the "imperialism" which was becoming a dominant factor in British politics. Few people realised the mighty change which in this respect had been effected in thought and feeling. Forty years before, the most prominent English statesmen had regarded with anxiety the huge responsibilities of a world-wide empire. In 1897 the whole tendency of thought and opinion was to enlarge the burden of which the preceding generation had been weary. The extension of British influence, the protection of British interests, were almost universally advocated; and the few statesmen who repeated in the 'nineties the sentiments which would have been generally accepted in the 'sixties, were regarded as "Little Englanders."

African Affairs

It is perhaps needless in this page to refer to the effect which these new ideas had on Oriental politics, whether in China or Turkey. But a few words must be added on the consequences which they produced in Africa. Both in the north and in the south of this great and imperfectly explored continent, memories still clung which were ungrateful to imperialism. In the north, the murder of Gordon was still unavenged; and the vast territory known as the Sudan had escaped from the control of Egypt. In the south, war with the Transvaal had been concluded by a British defeat; and the Dutch were elated, the English irritated, at the recollection of Majuba. In 1898 Lord Salisbury's government decided on extending the Anglo-Egyptian rule over the Sudan, and a great expedition was sent from Egypt under the command of Sir Herbert (afterwards Lord) Kitchener to Khartum. Few military expeditions have been more elaborately organised, or have achieved a more brilliant success. The Sudanese forces were decisively beaten, with great slaughter, in the immediate neighbourhood of Omdurman; and Khartum became thenceforward the capital of the new province, which was placed under Lord Kitchener's rule. Soon after this decisive success, a French exploring expedition under Major Marchand reached the Upper Nile and hoisted the French flag at Fashoda. It was obvious that the French could not be allowed to remain at a spot which the khedive of Egypt claimed as Egyptian territory; and after some negotiation, and some irritation, the French were withdrawn. In South Africa still more important events were in the meanwhile progressing. Ever since the independence of the South African Republic had been virtually conceded by the convention of 1884, unhappy differences had prevailed between the Dutch and British residents in the Transvaal. The discovery of gold at Johannesburg and elsewhere had led to a large immigration of British and other colonists. Johannesburg had grown into a great and prosperous city. The foreign population of the Transvaal, which was chiefly English, became actually more numerous than the Boers themselves, and they complained that they were deprived of all political rights, that they were subjected to unfair taxation, and that they were hampered in their industry and unjustly treated by the Dutch courts and Dutch officials.

[1895-1899 A.D.]

Failing to obtain redress, at the end of 1895 certain persons among them contemplated a revolution. Dr. Jameson, who was administering the adjacent territory of Rhodesia, accompanied by some British officers, actually attempted an invasion of the Transvaal. His force, utterly inadequate for the purpose, was stopped by the Boers, and he and his fellow-officers were taken prisoners. There was no doubt that this raid on the territory of a friendly state was totally unjustifiable. Unfortunately, Dr. Jameson's original plan had been framed with the knowledge of Mr. Rhodes, the prime minister at the Cape, and many persons thought that they ought to have been suspected by the colonial office in London. England at any rate would have had no valid ground of complaint if the leaders of a buccaneering force had been summarily dealt with by the Transvaal authorities. The president of the republic, Mr. Kruger, however, handed over his prisoners to the British authorities, and parliament instituted an inquiry by a select committee into the circumstances of the raid. The inquiry was terminated somewhat abruptly. The committee acquitted the colonial office of any knowledge of the plot; but a good many suspicions remained unanswered. The chief actors in the raid were tried under the Foreign Enlistment Act, found guilty, and subsequently released after short terms of imprisonment. Mr. Rhodes himself was not removed from the privy council, as his more extreme accusers demanded; but he had to abandon his career in Cape politics for a time, and confine his energies to the development of Rhodesia.

In consequence of these proceedings, the Transvaal authorities at once set to work to accumulate armaments, and they succeeded in procuring vast quantities of artillery and military stores. The British government would undoubtedly have been entitled to insist that these armaments should cease. It was obvious that they could only be directed against Great Britain; and no nation is bound to allow another people to prepare great armaments to be employed against itself. The criminal folly of the raid prevented the British government from making this demand. It could not say that the Transvaal government had no cause for alarm when British officers had attempted an invasion of its territory and had been treated rather as heroes than as criminals at home. Ignorant of the strength of Great Britain, and elated by the recollection of their previous successes, the Boers themselves believed that a new struggle might give them predominance in South Africa. The knowledge that a large portion of the population of Cape Colony was of Dutch extraction, and that public men at the Cape sympathised with them in their aspirations, increased their confidence. In the meantime, while the Boers were silently and steadily continuing their military preparations, the British settlers at Johannesburg—the Uitlanders, as they were called—were demanding consideration for their grievances.

Boer War (1899 A.D.)

In the spring of 1899, Sir Alfred Milner, governor of the Cape, met President Kruger at Bloemfontein, the capital of the Orange Free State, and endeavoured to accomplish that result by negotiation. He thought, at the time, that if the Uitlanders were given the franchise and a fair proportion of influence in the legislature, other difficulties might be left to settle themselves. The negotiations thus commenced unfortunately failed. The discussion, which had originally turned on the franchise, was enlarged by the introduction of the question of suzerainty or supremacy; and at last, in the beginning of October, when the rains of an African spring were causing the grass to grow

on which the Boer armies were largely dependent for forage, the Boers declared war and invaded Natal. The British government had not been altogether happy in its conduct of the preceding negotiations. It was certainly unhappy in its preparations for the struggle. It made the great mistake of underrating the strength of its enemy; it suffered its agents to commit the strategic blunder of locking up a few troops it had in an untenable position in the north of Natal. It was not surprising, in such circumstances, that the earlier months of the war should have been memorable for a series of exasperating reverses. These reverses, however, were redeemed by the valour of the British troops, the spirit of the British nation, and the enthusiasm which induced the great autonomous colonies of the empire to send men to support the cause of the mother country. The gradual arrival of reinforcements, and the appointment of a soldier of genius—Lord Roberts—to the supreme command, changed the military situation; and, before the summer of 1900 was concluded, the places which had been besieged by the Boers—Kimberley, Ladysmith and Mafeking—had been successively relieved; the capitals of the Orange Free State and of the Transvaal had been occupied; and the two republics, which had rashly declared war against the British Empire, had been formally annexed to the dominions of the queen.

The defeat and dispersal of the Boer armies, and the apparent collapse of Boer resistance, induced a hope that the war was over; and the government seized the opportunity to terminate the parliament, which had already endured for more than five years. The election was conducted with unusual bitterness; but the constituencies practically affirmed the policy of the government by maintaining, almost unimpaired, the large majority which the unionists had secured in 1895. Unfortunately, the expectations which had been formed at the time of the dissolution were disappointed. The same circumstances which had emboldened the Boers to declare war in the autumn of 1899, induced them to renew a guerilla warfare in the autumn of 1900—the approach of an African summer supplying the Boers with the grass on which they were dependent for feeding their hardy horses. Guerilla bands suddenly appeared in different parts of the Orange River Colony and of the Transvaal. They interrupted the communications of the British armies; they won isolated victories over British detachments; they even attempted the invasion of the Cape Colony. Thus the year which concluded the century closed in disappointment and gloom.^b

THE QUEEN'S LAST YEAR AND DEATH

But if the South African War proved more serious than had been anticipated, it did more to weld the empire together than years of peaceful progress might have accomplished. The queen's frequent messages of thanks and greeting to her colonies and to the troops sent by them, and her reception of the latter at Windsor, gave evidence of the heartfelt joy with which she saw the sons of the empire giving their lives for the defence of its integrity; and the satisfaction which she showed in the federation of the Australian colonies was no less keen. The reverses of the first part of the Boer campaign, together with the loss of so many of her officers and soldiers, caused no small part of that "great strain" of which the *Court Circular* spoke in the ominous words which first told her majesty's subjects that she was seriously ill. But the queen faced the new situation with her usual courage, devotion, and strength of will. She reviewed the departing regiments; she entertained the wives and children of the Windsor soldiers who had gone to the war; she showed

[1899-1900 A.D.]

by frequent messages her watchful interest in the course of the campaign and in the efforts which were being made throughout the whole empire; and her Christmas gift of a box of chocolate to every soldier in South Africa was a touching proof of her sympathy and interest. She relinquished her annual holiday on the Riviera, feeling that at such a time she ought not to leave her country. Entirely on her own initiative, and moved by admiration for the fine achievements of "her brave Irish" during the war, the queen announced her intention of paying a long visit to Dublin; and there, accordingly, she went for the month of April, 1899, staying in the viceregal lodge, receiving many of the leaders of Irish society, inspecting some fifty thousand school children from all parts of Ireland, and taking many a drive amid the charming scenery of the neighbourhood of Dublin. She went even farther than this attempt to conciliate Irish feeling, and to show her recognition of the gallantry of the Irish soldiers she issued an order for them to wear the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day, and for a new regiment of Irish Guards to be constituted.

In the previous November the queen had had the pleasure of receiving, on a private visit, her grandson, the German emperor, who came accompanied by the empress and by two of their sons. His foreign minister, Count von Bülow, was with him; there were long interviews with Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain; and there was a rapid visit to Sandringham, where Bishop Creighton preached a strong sermon on the need of a good understanding between the United Kingdom and Germany, to which the emperor replied, "You are preaching a doctrine which I am endeavoring with all my strength to impress upon my people." This visit of her grandson cheered the queen, and the successes of the army which followed the arrival of Lord Roberts in Africa occasioned great joy to her, as she testified by many published messages. But independently of the public anxieties of the war, and of those aroused by the violent and unexpected outbreak of fanaticism in China, the year brought deep private griefs to the queen. In 1899 her grandson, the hereditary prince of Coburg, had succumbed to phthisis, and in 1900 his father, the duke of Coburg, the queen's second son, previously known as the duke of Edinburgh, also died (July 30th). Then Prince Christian Victor, the queen's grandson, fell a victim to enteric fever at Pretoria; and during the autumn it came to be known that the empress Frederick, the queen's eldest daughter, was very seriously ill. Moreover, just at the end of the year a loss which greatly shocked and grieved the queen was experienced in the sudden death, at Windsor Castle, of the dowager lady Churchill, one of her majesty's oldest and most intimate friends.

These losses told upon the queen at her advanced age. Throughout her life she had enjoyed excellent health, and even in the last few years the only marks of age were rheumatic stiffness of the joints, which prevented walking, and a diminished power of eyesight. In the autumn of 1900, however, her health began definitely to fail, and though arrangements were made for another holiday in the south, it was plain that her strength was seriously affected. Still she continued the ordinary routine of her duties and occupations. Before Christmas she made her usual journey to Osborne, and there on January 2nd she received Lord Roberts on his return from South Africa and handed to him the insignia of the Garter. A fortnight later she commanded a second visit from the field-marshal; she continued to transact business, and until a week before her death she still took her daily drive. A sudden loss of power then supervened, and on Friday evening, January 18th, the *Court Circular* published an authoritative announcement of her illness. On Tuesday, January 22nd, 1901, she died.

Queen Victoria was a ruler of a new type. When she ascended the throne the popular faith in kings and queens was on the decline. She revived that faith; she consolidated her throne; she not only captivated the affections of the multitude, but won the respect of thoughtful men; and all this she achieved by methods which to her predecessors would have seemed impracticable—methods which it required no less shrewdness to discover than force of character and honesty of heart to adopt steadfastly. The queen was no woman of placid temperament who could remain indifferent to public affairs so long as her domestic concerns were not interfered with. To imagine that she divested herself of all responsibilities and secured to herself a peaceful life by doing, without reflection, whatever her ministers advised, would be absolutely to misunderstand her intelligent, sensitive nature, and to ascribe grand results to very petty causes. Whilst all who approached the queen bore witness to her candour and reasonableness in relation to her ministers, all likewise proclaimed how anxiously she considered advice that was submitted to her before letting herself be persuaded that she must accept it for the good of her people. By thus acting she put statesmen on their mettle, raised the level of public morality, and laid down the lines of action for a modern constitutional ruler.

Though richly endowed with saving common sense, the queen was not specially remarkable for high development of any specialised intellectual force. Her whole life, public and private, was an abiding lesson in the paramount importance of character. John Bright said of her that what specially struck him was her absolute truthfulness. For nearly sixty-four years she watched, at first diffidently, later with ever-maturing experience, but always with insight, sympathy, and genuine patriotism, over the developments of national policy. The condition of Europe when she ascended the throne was one of extreme instability. A few years later it became one of turmoil and confusion, in which dynasties were overthrown and high potentates had to flee their countries for asylum elsewhere. That the British throne came through that troublous time unscathed, and even with added prestige, must be ascribed in no small measure to the character of its occupant. The extent of her family connections and the correspondence she maintained with foreign sovereigns, together with the confidence inspired by her personal character, often enabled her to smooth the rugged places of international relations; and she gradually became in later years the mother of her people and the link between all parts of a democratic empire, the citizens of which felt a passionate loyalty for their venerable queen.

By her long reign and unblemished record her name had become associated inseparably with British institutions and British solidarity. Her own life was by choice, and as far as her position would admit, one of almost austere simplicity and homeliness, and her subjects were proud of a royalty which involved none of the mischiefs of caprice or ostentation, but set an example alike of motherly sympathy and of queenly dignity. She was mourned at her death not by her own country only, nor even by all English-speaking people, but by the whole world. The funeral in London on the 1st and 2nd of February, including first the passage of the coffin from the Isle of Wight to Gosport between lines of warships, and secondly a military procession from London to Windsor, was a memorable solemnity; from beginning to end there was no false note, but a simple and serious realisation that the greatest of English sovereigns, whose name would in history mark an age, had gone to her rest.^c

[1837-1901 A.D.]

A RETROSPECTIVE GLANCE

The reign of the queen may, perhaps, be divided into three periods. During nearly the whole of the first period, from 1837 to 1862, she had her consort by her side, and was largely influenced by his advice. The prince's stiff and reserved manners, however, diverted attention from his many admirable qualities; and the court hardly enjoyed the full measure of popularity which it deserved at the time and which it acquired later on. During the second period, from the death of the prince consort to the earlier eighties, the sorrow which had fallen on the queen induced her to withdraw from the more prominent duties of her position; the people grew accustomed to the absence of their sovereign, and forgot or were unaware of the many great services which she was rendering to them. Even during these years of mourning, however, the queen's sympathy with suffering made a profound impression on the nation; and if in some respects she lost ground as a ruler, she gained the affection of her subjects by her many excellent qualities as a woman. But it was not till her jubilee of 1887 that the people generally became thoroughly acquainted with the great qualities of their sovereign. The queen herself saw with surprise the admiration and love which her presence everywhere excited. Thenceforward she emerged more and more from her retirement, and made exertions, which were the more remarkable from the growing infirmities of her age, to display her gratitude for her people's appreciation. She acquired in these years a popularity which no British sovereign, and perhaps no sovereign in the world, has ever enjoyed; and, partly through her connection with the ruling houses of Europe, and partly in consequence of the authority bestowed by age and experience, she exercised an influence abroad almost as great and beneficial as that which she exerted at home.

The long period over which her reign extended was, in one sense, the most remarkable in the history of the world. So far as the English-speaking races were concerned, it witnessed a material and moral progress which has no parallel in their annals. During her reign the people of Great Britain doubled their number; but the accumulated wealth of the country increased at least threefold and its trade sixfold. All classes shared the prevalent prosperity. Notwithstanding the increase of population, the roll of paupers at the end of the reign, compared with the same roll at the beginning, stood as 2 stands to 3; the criminals as 1 to 2. The expansion abroad was still more remarkable. There were not two hundred thousand white persons in Australasia when the queen came to the throne; there were nearly five million when she died. The great Australian colonies were almost created in her reign; two of them—Victoria and Queensland—owe their names to her; they all received those autonomous institutions under which their prosperity had been built up during its continuance. Expansion and progress were not confined to Australasia. The opening months of the queen's reign were marked by rebellion in Canada. The close of it saw Canada one of the most loyal portions of the empire. In Africa, the advance of the red line which marks the bounds of British dominion has been even more rapid; while in India the Punjab, Scindh, Oudh, and Burma are some of the acquisitions which were added to the British Empire while the queen was on the throne. When she died one square mile in four of the land in the world was under the British flag, and at least one person out of every five persons alive was a subject of the queen.

Material progress was largely facilitated by industry and invention. The first railways had been made, the first steamship had been built, before the

queen came to the throne. But, so far as railways are concerned, none of the great trunk lines had been constructed in 1837; the whole capital authorised to be spent on railway construction did not exceed £55,000,000; and, five years after the reign had begun, there were only 18,000,000 passengers. The paid-up capital of British railways now exceeds £1,100,000,000; the passengers, not including season ticket-holders, also number 1,100,000,000; and the sum which is annually spent in working the lines considerably exceeds the whole capital authorised to be spent on their construction in 1837. The progress of the commercial marine was still more noteworthy. In 1837 the entire commercial navy comprised 2,800,000 tons, of which less than 100,000 tons were moved by steam. At the end of the reign the tonnage of British merchant vessels had reached 13,700,000 tons, of which more than 11,000,000 tons were moved by steam. At the beginning of the reign it was supposed to be impossible to build a steamer which could either cross the Atlantic or face the monsoon in the Red Sea. The development of steam navigation since then has made Australia much more accessible than America was in 1837, and has brought New York, for all practical purposes, nearer to London than Aberdeen was at the commencement of the reign. Electricity has had a greater effect on communication than steam on locomotion; and electricity, as a practical invention, had its origin in the reign. The first experimental telegraph line was erected only in the year in which Queen Victoria came to the throne. Submarine telegraphy, which has done so much to knit the empire together, was not perfected for many years afterwards; and long ocean cables were almost entirely constructed in the last half of the reign.

These are some of the more striking changes which have taken place in the period in question. Concentrated as they have been in the years which have been covered by a single reign, they impart additional importance and interest to the age of Queen Victoria. On personal grounds her memory will be consecrated in history as that of the best of sovereigns; on imperial grounds her reign will be recollected for the extension of the British Empire, the expansion of the British race, and the material and moral progress of the British people.^b

THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD VII (1901 A.D.)

It was the especial distinction of Albert Edward, prince of Wales, to have been an ornament and support of the throne before he was called upon to fill it himself. This cannot be said of any of his predecessors except Edward the Black Prince. Most princes of Wales have either died or attained the regal dignity too early to leave any conspicuous mark in history as princes. Since the days of the Black Prince only two have enjoyed a popularity comparable to Prince Albert Edward's—Henry of Monmouth and Henry, the son of James I. The glories of Henry V have cast a veil over the irregularities of Prince Hal; and the popularity of the Stuart prince Henry arose in great measure from his suppressed antagonism to his father, and the expectation that he would reverse the latter's policy. The other two princes of Wales who have filled a conspicuous place in the public eye, Prince Frederick and George IV, were neither dutiful nor popular. It was reserved for the son of Queen Victoria to show what strength an heir-apparent exemplary in the discharge of the duties of his station can bring to a monarchy, and how important a place, even with the most scrupulous abstinence from party politics, he can fill in the life of a self-governing nation. He was a keen patron of the theatre, and made it his business to know and remember all the distinguished

[1890-1901 A.D.]

men of the time in arts and letters. His thoroughly British taste for sport was as pronounced as his inclination for most of the contemporary amusements of society. The "Tranby Croft Case" (1890), in which Sir William Gordon Cumming brought an unsuccessful libel action for having been accused of cheating at a game of baccarat, caused some comment in connection with the prince's appearance in the witness-box on behalf of the defendants. But



EDWARD VII

it did him no disservice with the people to have twice won the Derby with his horses Persimmon (1896) and Diamond Jubilee (1900), and his interest in yacht-racing was conspicuously shown at all the important fixtures, his yacht *Britannia* being one of the best of her day. In other respects his activity in the life of the nation and his wide interests may be illustrated by his establishment (1897) of the Prince of Wales Hospital Fund, his devotion to the cause of Masonry (he was first elected grand master of the Freemasons of England in 1874), and his position as a bencher of the Middle Temple, where he also became (1887) treasurer. It was on the occasion of his first appearance at "Grand Night" that the students were for the first time allowed to follow the prince's example and to smoke in hall; and this was only one

instance of the influence in this respect which the prince's taste for tobacco had on English society.

On the death of Queen Victoria on January 22nd, 1901, the question what title the new king would assume was speedily set at rest by the popular announcement that he would be called Edward VII. The new reign began auspiciously by the holding of a privy council at St. James' Palace, at which the king announced his intention to follow in his predecessor's footsteps and to govern as a constitutional sovereign, and received the oaths of allegiance. On 14th February the king and queen opened parliament in state. Shortly afterwards it was announced that the visit of the duke and duchess of York to Australia, in order to inaugurate the new commonwealth, which had been sanctioned by Queen Victoria, would be proceeded with; and on March 16th they set out on board the *Ophir* with a brilliant suite. The tour lasted till November 1st, the duke and duchess having visited Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, and Canada; and on their return the king, on November 9th, created the duke prince of Wales and earl of Chester. In the mean while parliament had settled the new civil list at £470,000 a year. The question of enlarging the royal title to include specific mention of the colonial empire had been discussed during the year, and on July 30th parliament passed a bill to enable the king to style himself Edward VII, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of all the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.^d

EVENTS OF 1902-1904

Early in January, 1902, negotiations were begun looking towards a cessation of hostilities in South Africa, and at length, after many delays and setbacks, peace was signed at Pretoria on May 30th. The account of the war in detail will be found in our South Africa. Elaborate preparations had been made for the coronation of King Edward, which was set for June 26th, 1902. Two days earlier, however, it was announced that the king was suffering from perityphlitis, and an operation was performed by Sir Frederick Treves. The programme of festivities was abandoned, and anxiety and friendly concern were manifested not only throughout the British Empire but the whole civilised world. On June 27th the attending physician declared the king "out of immediate danger." The coronation was then set for August 9th. On June 30th a conference of colonial premiers began its session in London.

Before that day, however, Lord Salisbury, carrying out his previously announced intention, retired on July 13th from the post of premier, and was succeeded by his nephew, the right honourable Arthur James Balfour. Within a few days Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, chancellor of the exchequer, and Earl Cadogan, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, retired from office. On August 9th the coronation was carried out successfully, but somewhat less elaborately than had been originally planned.

During the summer and fall several by-elections to vacant seats in parliament showed a surprising liberal gain. On September 15th an important commercial treaty with China was signed. Parliament reassembled on October 16th, an incident of the opening being the expulsion of John O'Donnell, an Irish radical member, for an insult to Mr. Balfour. On November 5th parliament voted £8,000,000 in aid of the South African colonies. The single great triumph of the parliamentary session, which ended December 18th, was the passage of the long-pending Ministerial Education Bill. The coercive measures adopted by Germany, Italy, and Great Britain to force

[1902-1904 A.D.]

Venezuela to pay certain debts owing to private citizens of those countries led on the last day before adjournment to Mr. Balfour's acknowledgment that a state of war practically existed between Great Britain and Venezuela.

On the last day of the year a treaty creating a defensive and offensive alliance between Great Britain and Japan was signed. The first parliament of 1903 was opened by the king in person on February 17th. The most important piece of legislation was the passage of the Irish Land Act, which became operative in November following.

The chief question of interest under discussion during the summer months of 1903 was Mr. Chamberlain's demand for a revision of the commercial policy and fiscal system of the empire. On September 17th Mr. Chamberlain withdrew from the Balfour cabinet, not, as he explained, because he was out of agreement with it, but in order that he might have greater personal freedom to push a protectionist propaganda. At the same time Mr. Ritchie, who had succeeded Sir Michael Hicks-Beach as chancellor of the exchequer in 1902, and Lord George Hamilton, secretary for India, were allowed by Mr. Balfour, without being informed that Mr. Chamberlain himself was on the point of withdrawing, to withdraw from the ministry, on the ground that they being free-traders could not logically sit in a cabinet dominated by Mr. Chamberlain.

These resignations were followed in a few days by those of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, secretary for Scotland, and Mr. Arthur Elliot, financial secretary of the treasury, and early in October by that of Lord Devonshire, president of the council and conservative leader in the house of lords. The vacancies were at once filled and the ministry reconstructed on more strongly protectionist lines. At the same time Mr. Balfour made a more definite statement of his position by declaring that he did not advocate high protectionism, but merely the adoption of a system that would enable Great Britain to discriminate against the products of protectionist countries. Following this, Mr. Chamberlain in a speech at Glasgow on October 6th explained his tariff scheme as applying only to foreign countries and not to British colonies. These more explicit statements of the matters under discussion aroused the country from political stagnation, and had the effect of rending asunder the long successful unionist coalition and reuniting the factions in the liberal party.

The event of the year 1904 of most interest in British foreign relations was the signing of an agreement on April 7th by Lord Lansdowne on the part of Great Britain and M. Delcassé on the part of France, relating to the settlement of several long-standing differences in regard to the colonial interests of the two countries. The most important points settled were the relinquishment by France of its exclusive rights to the "French shore" of Newfoundland and the recognition by England of France's claims in Morocco."



BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS

[The letter * is reserved for Editorial Matter.]

CHAPTER I. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLAND FROM 1793 to 1815

C. W. C. OMAN, article written for the present work.—A. ALISON, *History of Europe*.—* CHARLES KNIGHT, *History of England*.—W. H. S. AUBREY, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation*.

CHAPTER II. REACTION AND REFORM [1816-1830 A.D.]

* HENRY BROUGHAM, *Speeches*.—ROBERT SOUTHY, *Essex's Letters*.—* THOMAS TOOKER, *History of Prices*.—SAMUEL ROMILLY, *Memoirs*.—* SIMMEL, *Two in Great Britain*.—* SAMUEL BAMPFORD, *Passages in the Life of a Radical*.—* CHAR. KNIGHT, *History of England*.—* EDWARD OSLER, *Life of Admiral Viscount Exmouth*.—* WALLACE, *History of the Life and Reign of George IV.*—* LORD EXMOUTH, Letters to his brother in Osler's *Life of Exmouth*.—* C. MACFARLANE and T. THOMSON, *The Comprehensive History of England*.—* HARRIS MARTINEAU, *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*.—* SYDNEY SMITH, *Memoirs of Lady Holland*.—* L. HANSARD, *Parliamentary Debates*.—* RICHARD BURN, *Narrative of a Resident at the Court of London from 1817 till 1825*.—* G. TUCKER, *Life of Thomas Jefferson*.—* W. HUSKISSON, *Speeches*.—* ANNUAL REGISTER.—* G. R. PORTER, *The Progress of the Nation*.—* H. TWISS, *Life of Lord Eldon*.—* A. DE FOHRLANQUE, *England under Seven Administrations*.—* P. H. STANHOPE, *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel*.—* T. R. MALTHUS, *An Essay on the Principles of Population*.—* R. J. MACKINTOSH, *Life of Sir James Mackintosh*.—* W. H. S. AUBREY, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation*.—* LORD CAMPBELL, *Chief Justice of England*.

CHAPTER III. WILLIAM IV AND THE REFORM BILL [1830-1837 A.D.]

* T. ERSKINE MAY, *A Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III*.—* C. MACFARLANE and T. THOMSON, *The Comprehensive History of England*.—* H. TWISS, *Life of Lord Eldon*.—* SYDNEY SMITH, *Speech at Townton, October 18, 1831*.—* A. P. STANLEY, *Life of Thomas Arnold*.—* H. BROUGHAM, *The British Constitution*.—* J. A. ROEDUCK, *History of the Whig Ministry of 1830*.—* H. MARTINEAU, *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*.—* C. KNIGHT, *History of England*.—* SPENCER WALPOLE, *History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815*.—* G. R. PORTER, *The Progress of the Nation*.

CHAPTER IV. EARLY YEARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA [1837-1856 A.D.]

* A. ALISON, *History of Europe*.—* SPENCER WALPOLE, article on "English History" in the *New Volumes* of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—* SPENCER WALPOLE, article on "Queen Victoria" in the *New Volumes* of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—* C. KNIGHT, *History of England*.—* H. MARTINEAU, *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*.—* W. H. S. AUBREY, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation*.—* R. PEEL, *Memoirs*.—* T. MARTIN, *Life of the Prince Consort*.

CHAPTER V. HALF A CENTURY OF PROGRESS [1856-1904 A.D.]

* SPENCER WALPOLE, article on "English History" in the *New Volumes* of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—* G. C. LEVEY, article on "Queen Victoria" in the *New Volumes* of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—* ANONYMOUS, article on "Edward VII" in the *New Volumes* of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.



A CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D.

- 1792 Bill for abolition of slave trade passes the commons. Pitt hinders Holland from joining the coalition. Pitt's efforts for peace unsuccessful. Society of the Friends of the People formed to promote parliamentary reform. Riots in Sheffield and Dundee: the militia called out. Disabilities of Irish Catholics removed. Preparations for war. Trial of Thomas Paine.
- 1793 Impending war with France. The Alien bill. Death of Louis XVI. England declares war against France. England, Spain, and Holland join Austria, and Prussia in the first coalition. French successes on the Continent and against the royalists in France. Traitorous Correspondence act passed. Catholic Relief act for Scotland, removing various disabilities. Trials for treason of Muir, Palmer, and others. English driven from Toulon.
- 1794 English driven from Holland. Lord Howe's victory over French fleet. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus act. Coalition between Pitt and the majority of the whigs. Duke of York defeated at Bois-le-duc. Execution of Robespierre.
- 1795 Prince of Wales marries Caroline of Brunswick. Establishment of the Directorate in France. Lord Camden becomes viceroy of Ireland. Acquittal of Warren Hastings. War declared against Dutch: capture of Cape of Good Hope. Spain declares war against England. Treason act and the Sedition act carried.
- 1796 Pitt's negotiations with the Directorate for peace. French expedition to Ireland fails. Monetary crisis in England: suspension of cash payments. Burke's *Letters on a Regicidal Peace*.
- 1797 Nelson's victory at Cape St. Vincent. Mutiny at Spithead suppressed. Mutiny at the Nore. Disorganisation of the French government. Dutch fleet defeated off Camperdown. Desire of France to invade England.
- 1798 Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt. Battle of the Nile. Pitt forms the Second Coalition.
- 1799 Napoleon defeated at Nore through co-operation of Sir Sydney Smith. Duke of York, in command of expedition to Holland, is defeated at Bergen. Napoleon made first consul. Conquest of Mysore.
- 1800 Grenville rejects Bonaparte's proposals for peace. Surrender of Malta to English fleet. Act of Union with Ireland. Armed neutrality of northern powers is revived. The Corresponding Societies bill is passed.
- 1801 First imperial parliament of United Kingdom meets. George III rejects Pitt's plan of Catholic emancipation. Pitt resigns. Addington becomes premier. Abercrombie defeats the French at Alexandria. Battle of Copenhagen: destruction of Danish fleet by Nelson. Peace between England and Russia. Napoleon appropriates Holland, Switzerland, and Italy.
- 1802 Treaty of Amiens signed. Napoleon's continued aggressions cause change of feeling in England. Negotiations for Pitt's return. Publication of *Edinburgh Review*.
- 1803 Rupture of Treaty of Amiens. Peltier convicted for libel on Bonaparte. War declared against Bonaparte. Napoleon arrests English in France. Wellesley gains battle of Assaye over the Mahrattas. Several executions at Dublin for insurrection.

664 CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D.

- 1804 Addington resigns. Pitt forms a new administration. Preparations to resist Napoleonic invasion: bill for providing additional forces passed. Spain declares war against England. Napoleon made emperor. Addington joins the ministry. Failure of the Catamaran expedition.
- 1805 Napoleon's scheme at Boulogne fails. His abandonment of expeditions against England. Third Coalition formed against Napoleon. Battle of Ferrol: England against combined French and Spanish fleets. Battle of Trafalgar: death of Nelson. Melville is impeached for peculation. Sidmouth resigns. Napoleon's campaign at Austerlitz. Wellesley's recall.
- 1806 Death of William Pitt. Grenville and Fox form the ministry of "All the Talents." Fox negotiates with Napoleon. Death of Fox. Lord Horrick, Grenville, and Tierney assume office. Stuart defeats French at Maida. Battle of Jena. Napoleon issues his Berlin Decrees. Abolition of the slave trade carried.
- 1807 The Orders in Council, in reply to the Berlin Decrees. Rejection of bill to remove Catholic disabilities: fall of Grenville's ministry. Duke of Portland becomes prime minister. Treaty of Tilsit. Expeditions sent to the Dardanelles, Sicily, and Alexandria. Lord Minto made governor-general of India. Friction between England and United States caused by the Orders in Council: Whitelocke is defeated in expedition against Buenos Ayres. Bombardment of Copenhagen. Heligoland is taken. Seizure of the Danish fleet. Napoleon's armies in Spain.
- 1808 Spain rises against the French and demands English help. Wellesley sent to Portugal. The Peninsular War begins. Battle of Vimiers and Convention of Cintra. Sir John Moore's march to Salamanca. Napoleon in Madrid.
- 1809 Battle of Corunna: death of Moore. Wellesley defeats South at Oporto, and Victor at Talavera. Failure of expedition under Lord Chatham to Walcheren. Resignation of Canning and Castlereagh. Resignation of duke of Portland. His death. Perceval becomes prime minister. Revival of parliamentary reforms. America passes the Non-Intercourse act.
- 1810 Mauritius taken from the French. Burdett sent to the Tower for contempt. Riots ensue. Wellington defeats Massena at Busaco. The latter is forced to retreat from Torres Vedras. King's illness.
- 1811 Regency of prince of Wales. Graham defeats Victor at Barossa and Massena retires toward Ciudad Rodrigo. Wellington defeats Massena at Fuentes d'Onoro and takes Almeida. Beresford defeats Soult at Albuera. Luddite riots at Nottingham. Threatened war between Russia and France.
- 1812 Wellington storms Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajos. Wellesley resigns. Castlereagh becomes foreign secretary. Perceval assassinated by Bellingham in house of commons. Lord Liverpool becomes prime minister. Canning's laws in favour of Catholics. United States declare war against England. Victories of American frigates. Battle of Salamanca is won by Wellington. He retreats from Bourgoes. Dissenting ministers relieved from Conventicle act. Napoleon in Russia.
- 1813 Catholic Relief bill is dropped. Battle of Vitoria. Wellington defeats Joseph. Battle of the Pyrenees: defeat of Soult. Wellington storms St. Sebastian, and Pampeluna surrenders. Americans attack Canada.
- 1814 Invasion of France by Wellington. He wins battle of Orthez and defeats Soult at Toulouse (April). English join the Prussians in Holland. Battle of Chippewa. First Treaty of Paris. Visit of allied monarchs to the prince regent. British raid upon Washington. English defeated on Lake Champlain. Congress of Vienna: Lord Castlereagh represents England. British repulses at Plattsburg and New Orleans. Treaty of Ghent between England and United States.
- 1815 Napoleon's escape from Elba. Wellington and Blücher command the allied forces in Belgium. Napoleon defeats the Prussians at Ligny. Wellington defeats Ney at Quatre Bras. Battle of Waterloo. The allies enter Paris. Napoleon surrenders to English at Rochefort and is conveyed to St. Helena. Second Treaty of Paris. Holy Alliance made between Russia, Austria, and Prussia.
- 1816 Canning joins the government. The Corn law and the abolition of the property tax. Agricultural and commercial depression: riots in the east of England. Petition from corporation of London. Battle of Algiers.
- 1817 Attack on the prince regent. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus act. Government measure to repress disaffection. Military and Naval Officers' Oath bill passed. "Sidmouth Circular" issued. William Moore is tried for libel and acquitted. Grattan's motion for relief of Catholics. Death of Princess Charlotte.
- 1818 Suspension of Habeas Corpus act repealed. Renewal of Alien bill is carried. Motion for repeal of Septennial act is lost. Evacuation of France by the allies.
- 1819 Birth of Princess Victoria. Rejection of Catholic emancipation. Renewal of industrial distress. Resumption of cash payments. The Manchester massacre. The Six acts.
- 1820 Death of George III. George IV. succeeds. Danger of the ministry: Cato Street conspiracy. Execution of conspirators. Bill for Queen Caroline's divorce. Brougham defends the queen. The bill abandoned. England refuses to join the Congress of Troppau.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D. 665

- 1821 Catholic Relief bill passed by commons. Coronation of George IV. Queen's trial engenders an alienation of the ministry and people. Death of Napoleon Bonaparte.
- 1822 Peel and Wellesley join the ministry. Death of Castlereagh. Canning made foreign secretary: his diplomacy in Spain. Suicide of Lord Londonderry (formerly Castlereagh).
- 1823 Huskisson becomes president of board of trade. His changes in commercial policy. Change of the Navigation act: Huskisson carries his Reciprocity of Duties bill. Criminal law reform. Peel's Currency act. Discussion on slavery. England recognises freedom of South American republics. The Catholic Association formed.
- 1824 Reduction of duties on silk and wool. Repeal of acts limiting the free travelling of workmen. English are worsted in Ashantee war. Death of Byron in Greece.
- 1825 Bill to suppress Catholic Association. Catholic Relief bill is again rejected by the lords. Commissioner inquires into administration of court of chancery. Wild money speculations. Crash of joint-stock companies and banks. Robinson's budgets.
- 1826 Canning's policy in Portugal. Certain house taxes abolished. Dissolution of parliament.
- 1827 Death of duke of York. Resignation of Lord Liverpool. Canning becomes prime minister. Treaty of London between England, France, and Russia for pacification of Greece. Death of Canning. Lord Goderich becomes prime minister. Battle of Navarino. Destruction of Turco-Egyptian fleet and Goderich's inaction.
- 1828 Goderich resigns. Duke of Wellington becomes prime minister. Wellington refuses to coerce Turkey. Lord John Russell and parliamentary reform: Repeal of the Test and Corporation acts. The Corn bill passed. Resignation of Huskisson. Other "Canningites" resign. O'Connell elected to parliament, but cannot sit. Catholic Association is revived. The Catholic emancipation question raised.
- 1829 Resignation of Lord Anglesey. Act passed suppressing the Catholic Association. King opposes emancipation; then consents (March 8rd). Catholic Relief bill carried in commons and lords. O'Connell's agitation for repeal of union of England and Ireland. Annual act passed for suspending militia ballot.
- 1830 Death of George IV. Accession of William IV. Opening of Liverpool and Manchester Railway: death of Huskisson. England recognises Louis Philippe. Resignation of duke of Wellington. Lord Grey becomes prime minister.
- 1831 Lord John Russell introduces the Reform bill. Rejected in the lords. Riots in the country. Opposition of the king.
- 1832 The Reform bill passes the commons (March). Resignation of ministers. King's opposition is overcome. Reform bill passes the lords (June). Reform bills passed for Ireland and Scotland.
- 1833 First reformed parliament meets. Coercion act for Ireland passed. Position of the Irish Church: the Church Temporalities act is carried, reducing and reforming the Irish Church. Act for the Emancipation of Slaves passes the lords. Abolition of slavery in the colonies. Act passed for renewing the Bank charter. The first Factory act passed. East India trade thrown open. The Jewish Relief bill passes the commons, but is rejected by the lords in successive years till 1858. The Tractarian movement in English Church begins.
- 1834 The Poor Law Amendment act is carried. Resignation of ministers on the Irish Church question. Irish and Land-tax bill (proposing a substitute for tithes) thrown out by the lords. Resignation of Lord Althorp and Lord Grey. Lord Melbourne becomes prime minister. New Poor law is introduced. System of national education begun. Central criminal court established. The Irish Coercion act renewed in modified form. Lord Melbourne is dismissed by the king. Sir R. Peel forms an administration. Increase of trades unions. New charter granted to Bank of England. Ecclesiastical commission appointed to inquire into English Church. The Tamworth Manifesto: Sir R. Peel indicates his reforms.
- 1835 Various reforming bills are introduced. Resignation of Sir R. Peel. Lord Melbourne becomes prime minister. Condition of municipal corporations: the Municipal Reform act is passed. The Irish Tithe bill is passed by commons.
- 1836 Bill for Tithe Commutation in England passed. General Registration act. Newspaper stamp duty is reduced. The ecclesiastical commissioners are incorporated. Civil Marriage act. Lord Buckland governor-general of India. South Australia is first colonised.
- 1837 Death of William IV (June). Accession of Victoria. Duke of Cumberland becomes king of Hanover. Remissions of capital punishment. Natal founded by Dutch settlers and placed under English rule (1841). Rebellion in Canada. Danger of war with America. Rise of trades unions. Division in parliament into conservatives and liberals.
- 1838 Lord Durham appointed governor-general of Canada; he resigns soon after. The Irish Poor Law act passed. The Irish Tithes Commutation act passed. Act against non-residence of clergy passed. The people's charter adopted by the chartists. Forma-

- tion of the Anti-Corn-Law League. New Zealand is first permanently colonised. Capture of Candahar. Difficulties in Jamaica.
- 1839 The Jamaica bill is carried. The bed-chamber question: Sir Robert Peel declines office. Lord Melbourne again takes office. Rowland Hill's new postage scheme. Committee of privy council for education is instituted. Chartist insurrection at Newport. War with China. Occupation of Kabul. Debates on Irish affairs. France and England differ as to Egypt.
- 1840 Victoria marries Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg. Blockade of Canton by English fleet. Popular constitution is granted to Canada. Threatened breach with France. Quadruple Alliance with France, Portugal, and Spain. Bombardment of Acre. Irish Municipal act passed. Agitation for repeal of union with Ireland. Introduction of penny postage. War with Egypt. Defeat of Mehemet Ali.
- 1841 Cobden's free-trade agitation. Fall of the Melbourne ministry. Peel's new ministry. Duke of Buckingham leaves cabinet. Palmerston's foreign policy. Attack on Canton.
- 1842 Peel's first free-trade budget: Income-tax revived; revision of the customs tariff. Evacuation of Kabul. Defeat of Chinese: peace concluded between China and England. Lord Ellenborough is made governor-general of India. War in India. Massacre of English army in Afghanistan. Annexation of Scinde. Battles of Meeanee and Hyderabad. Treaty of Nankin. Misery of the working classes. Ashley's Collieries' bill carried.
- 1843 House of commons refuses petition of the general assembly of Scotland. Great secession from the Scottish church. Establishment of the Free Church in Scotland. The Irish Arms act is passed. Cobden and Bright lead the Anti-Corn-Law League. O'Connor issues his land scheme. Return of Dost Mahomed. O'Connell and other repeal leaders are arrested. The Rebecca riots.
- 1844 Trial of O'Connell: reversal of his sentence. Commercial prosperity and remission of further duties. Sir R. Peel's Bank Charter act is passed. The Currency bill. Boers are forced to submit. Natal declared a British colony. Hardinge becomes governor-general of India. Graham's Factory bill. The Tahiti question.
- 1845 Peel's second free-trade budget. Renewal of income-tax. Peel's Maynooth act. He founds Queen's Colleges in Ireland. The Irish famine. Spread of the Anti-Corn-Law League. Sir R. Peel proposes repeal of the Corn laws. He resigns office. Lord J. Russell fails to form a cabinet. Sir R. Peel resumes office. Great meeting of Anti-Corn-Law League at Manchester. War declared against the Sikhs. Battles of Moodkee and Ferozeshah. Newman joins the Church of Rome.
- 1846 Sir R. Peel's proposal for repeal of Corn laws carried in commons and lords. Protest signed by eighty-nine peers. Government is defeated on Irish bill. Sir R. Peel resigns. Lord John Russell becomes prime minister. Battles of Sohraon and Aliwal. Treaty of Lahore and end of the first Sikh war. Potato famine in Ireland and large Irish emigration.
- 1847 Government grant of ten millions for relief of Ireland. Relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland. Fielden's Factory bill passed. Parliament passes Coercion bill for Ireland. The Poor Law board is constituted. Strained relations between France and England. Corn and Navigation acts suspended. Death of O'Connell.
- 1848 Louis Philippe arrives in England. Suppression of the chartists and Irish rebels. Treason Felony act is passed. Jewish Disabilities bill passed by commons, thrown out by lords. Louis Napoleon declared president-elect of French Republic. Boers are made to acknowledge the sovereignty of England. Lord Dalhousie governor-general of India. The Punjab War. Habeas Corpus act suspended in Ireland.
- 1849 Battles of Chillianwallah and Goojerat. Annexation of the Punjab. End of second Sikh war. Irish encumbered states court is established. Navigation Laws repealed. Difficulties in India. Reform of the colonial office.
- 1850 Australian Constitution bill passed. Victoria made a separate colony. English fleet sent to Greece. Death of Sir R. Peel. Irish Tenant League formed. The Ecclesiastical Titles bill. Papal bull issued creating Roman Catholic bishops in England. Great gold discoveries in Australia.
- 1851 The Great Exhibition. Ministerial defeat on the county franchise. Lord John Russell resigns. Lord Stanley is unable to form a ministry and Lord John Russell returns to office. Palmerston's despatch to Normandy and his dismissal from the ministry. Lord Granville becomes foreign secretary. The Ecclesiastical Titles bill passed.
- 1852 The Militia bill rejected and subsequently carried. End of the Russell ministry. Lord Derby becomes prime minister. Bribery act passed for inquiring into corrupt practices. Death of the duke of Wellington. Disraeli's budget is defeated. Resignation of Lord Derby. Lord Aberdeen forms a coalition ministry and becomes prime minister. A constitution given to the colonies in New Zealand.
- 1853 Gladstone introduces his first budget and abolishes various taxes. Burmese and Kafir Wars. The Crimean War begins. Union of England and France to protect Turkey against Russia. Conference of the powers. The English and French fleets enter the Dardanelles. Russia destroys Turkish fleet at Sinope. The Jewish Disabilities bill

- again rejected by the lords. Close of Kaffir War. British Kaffraria is annexed. New India bill is passed. Lord Palmerston resigns and again resumes office.
- 1854 Declaration of war by France and England against Russia. Baltic fleet despatched under Sir C. Napier. Russians unsuccessfully besiege Silistria (May). The allied armies land in Crimea. Battle of the Alma (September). The march to Balaklava. Siege of Sebastopol begins (October 17th). Battle of Balaklava. Battle of Inkerman (November). Government charged with gross mismanagement. Demand for change of ministry. Gladstone's budget. The University Reform bill. Colonial and war secretaryships are added. The first Cape parliament meets.
- 1855 Lord John Russell and Lord Aberdeen resign. Lord Palmerston becomes prime minister. The Vienna Conference. Committees of inquiry in Crimea. Reform of the army hospitals. Death of Lord Raglan. Battle of the Tchernaya. Fall and evacuation of Sebastopol. Surrender of Kars. Resignation of Lord J. Russell.
- 1856 Treaty of peace with Russia signed at Paris. Difficulties with America. The Persian War. The Chinese War. Annexation of Oudh. Lord Canning governor-general of India. Bombardment of Canton.
- 1857 Government condemnation of conduct in China. Palmerston announces dissolution. Indian mutiny. Outbreaks at Meerut, Delhi, Lucknow, and Cawnpore. Relief of Allahabad. Massacre of Cawnpore garrison. Havelock's victory at Fathipur. Relief of Lucknow under Havelock and Outram. Siege and fall of Delhi. Sir Colin Campbell's final relief of Lucknow. Death of Havelock. Destruction of Chinese fleet (June). Commercial panic in England. Suspension of Bank Charter act. The English and French capture Canton. Sepoy rebels punished for the mutiny. Treaty of peace between England and Persia signed at Paris.
- 1858 Sir C. Campbell and Outram capture Lucknow. Gradual reduction of the Indian provinces. Capture of Thansee, Calpee, Gwalior, Behar, and Oudh. Final suppression of the rebels and close of the mutiny. Lord Palmerston's bill transferring government of India from East India Company to the crown. Palmerston's new India bill. Formation of secretaryship of state for India. Lord Stanley is first secretary. Orsini's attempted assassination of the French emperor. Irritation felt against England. Palmerston's Conspiracy to Murder bill. Resignation of Palmerston. Lord Derby becomes prime minister. Treaty between England and China at Tientsin. Bill for admission of Jews to parliament passed. Queen of England proclaimed sovereign of India.
- 1859 Failure of Disraeli's reform bill. Resignation of ministry. Lord Palmerston becomes prime minister. Reorganisation of the Indian army. Queensland is made a separate colony. Rise of Fenianism. War in China.
- 1860 Capture of Peking. Treaty with China. Cobden's treaty of commerce with France. Church Rates Abolition bill carried in commons. Act regulating the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland. Rise of the broad church.
- 1861 Abolition of the paper duty. Change introduced by the Bankruptcy act. Forcible seizure of Confederate commissioners. Boers of the Transvaal form into a separate state. Death of the prince consort.
- 1862 War in Japan. The cotton famine.
- 1863 Strained relations with America arising from the cruisers. Marriage of the prince of Wales. Separation of the Ionian Islands from England and union with Greece. Death of Lord Elgin, viceroy of India.
- 1865 Poor Law Union Chargeability bill is passed. Resignation of lord chancellor. Dissolution of parliament. Defeat of Gladstone at Oxford University. Death of Lord Palmerston. Lord Russell becomes prime minister. The cruel suppression of the Jamaica insurrection.
- 1866 Suspension of Habeas Corpus act in Ireland. Gladstone introduces the government Reform bill. Disruption of the liberal party; the Adullamites. The government resigns. Lord Derby becomes prime minister. Commercial panic in the city. The Bank Charter act suspended.
- 1867 Disraeli again introduces the Reform bill. Resignation of ministers. Reform bill passes the lords. Expedition to rescue English prisoners from King Theodore of Abyssinia. Fenian and trades-union outrages. Confederation of the British North American provinces.
- 1868 Resignation of Lord Derby. Disraeli becomes prime minister. Gladstone's resolution for disestablishment of Irish Church. Gladstone's bill for abolition of compulsory church rates. The Irish and Scotch Reform bills passed. British troops capture Magdala in Abyssinia. Resignation of Disraeli. Gladstone becomes prime minister.
- 1869 Gladstone's measure for disestablishment of the Irish Church. Reform of the new land laws. The Endowed Schools' bill passed. University Tests Abolition bill passed by Commons. Lord Mayo viceroy of India. Gladstone's Irish Land bill.
- 1870 The Irish Land act is passed. The Elementary Education act passed. Peace Preservation act (Ireland) is passed. The Fenians invade Canada. The Home Govern-

- ment Association founded in Ireland. Treaty with France and Germany to secure neutrality of Belgium.
- 1871 Bill to abolish religious tests at universities passes the lords. Treaty of Washington made with the United States. Act passed giving the crown authority over militia, yeomanry, and volunteers. Dangerous illness of prince of Wales. The local government board is constituted. The Army Regulation bill; abolition of purchase of commissions by royal warrant. The Black Sea conferences.
- 1872 Reorganisation of the army. Ballot and Licensing bills passed. The Alabama arbitration. New commercial treaty with France.
- 1873 The Irish University bill rejected. Gladstone resigns and returns to office. Bill for abolition of religious tests at Dublin University passed. The Judicature bill. The Ashantee War in defence of Gold Coast settlement. Home Rule League is formed.
- 1874 Gladstone resigns. Disraeli becomes prime minister. Licensing act passed. Public Worship Regulation act passed. Endowed Schools Amendment bill passed. Spread of trades unionism. Prevalence of strikes. Ashantee War concluded. The Scotch Church Patronage bill.
- 1875 Retirement of Gladstone. Replaced by marquiss of Hartington. Irish Coercion bills renewed. John Mitchel's election declared void. The Judicature bill completed. The Artisans' Dwelling act. Agricultural Holdings bill. The Regimental Exchanges act. Land Transfer bill. Friendly Societies bill. Peace Preservation act (Ireland). Amendment of Labour laws. Merchant Shipping bill passed. Colony of Fiji constituted. Reopening of Eastern question: The Andrassy and Berlin notes. Central government established for New Zealand. England purchases shares in the Suez Canal.
- 1876 Lord Lytton viceroy of India. Famine in India. War between Serbia and Turkey. England urges reform upon the Turks. The Additional Tithes bill passed. England refuses to accede to Berlin note. Disraeli created earl of Beaconsfield. Appellate Jurisdiction act passed. Elementary Education act passed. Gladstone's indignation at Bulgarian atrocities. Punishment of offenders demanded. Salisbury attends the European conference at Constantinople.
- 1877 Failure of the conference at Constantinople. Turkey rejects the European protocol. Queen proclaimed empress of India. South African bill passed to confederate colonies of Natal, Cape of Good Hope, Orange Free State, and Transvaal. Annexation of the Transvaal, and difficulties with the Zulus. Russian war with Turkey: jingoism in England. Obstruction procedure by Parnell in house of commons.
- 1878 British fleet ordered to Constantinople. Lord Carnarvon and Lord Derby resign. Troops from India ordered to Malta. Death of Earl Russell. Agitation against war with Russia. Secret treaties with Russia and with Turkey. Occupation of Cyprus. Meeting of the Berlin Congress. Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury attend (June). Treaty of Berlin signed (July). War declared against Afghanistan. Invasion of Zululand.
- 1879 Depression of trade in England. Zulus defeat English at Isandhlwana. Flight and death of ameer of Afghanistan. Treaty of Gundamak signed with new ameer. Zulus defeated at Ulundi. Second invasion of Afghanistan. English victory at Charasiab and entry of Kabul. Difficulties in Transvaal. The Army Discipline and Regulation bill passed. Irish University act passed. Home-rulers' obstruction in parliament. Parnell's agitation against landlordism. A commission inquires into agricultural depression. Davitt forms the Irish Land League. Arrests of Irish leaders.
- 1880 Relief of Irish famine. Water Works bill. Marquis of Ripon, viceroy of India. Resignation of Lord Beaconsfield (April). Gladstone forms a ministry. English victories at Ahmed Kiel, in Afghanistan. English defeated at Maiwand. March of Roberts from Kabul to Kandahar. Goschen sent on mission to Constantinople. Bradlaugh not permitted to make affirmation. Second Relief of Distress act for Ireland passed. The Burials' bill carried. Employers' Liability act passed. Prosecution of Parnell and others. Revolt of the Boers of Transvaal.
- 1881 English troops in Transvaal defeated at Laing's Nek and Majuba Hill. Boers agree to British suzerainty. Thirty-six Irish members suspended and removed from House. Protection of Life and Property bill and Preservation bill passed. Death of Lord Beaconsfield. Irish Land bill receives the royal assent (August). The Regulation of the Forces' act and Army act passed. Kandahar ceded to the ameer of Afghanistan. The Land League proclaimed "an illegal and criminal association."
- 1882 Bradlaugh expelled from house of commons. Plot of Arabi Bey against English influence in Egypt. He gains command of the army. British fleet bombards and destroys the fortifications of Alexandria. Defeat of Arabi's army at Tel-el-Kebir by English under Wolseley. Arabi, taken prisoner, is banished from Egypt for life. Murder of Cavendish and Burke. Irish obstruction in parliament and suspension of twenty-five Irish members. Several Procedure bills regulating parliament business passed.
- 1883 Explosives bill passed. Trial of the Invincibles. Corrupt Practices bill and Agricultural Holdings bill passed. The Bankruptcy bill and Patent Law bill passed.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D. 669


- 1884 General Gordon sent to Khartum. Battle of Trinkitat. Fall of Sinkat and Tokar. Graham defeats Osman Digna. Conference of Great Powers as to affairs of Egypt. Wolseley enters the Soudan with British troops. The Albert bill passed by the council of India. New convention signed with Transvaal. Lord Dufferin appointed viceroy of India. Sir C. Warren despatched to Bechuanaland. The Franchise bill becomes law (December 6th).
- 1885 Defeat of Arabs at Abuklea by General Stewart. Khartum surrenders to the mahdi. Death of Gordon. The Berber expedition to Egypt. Troops withdrawn from the Soudan. The Afghanistan Boundary Commission: dispute with Russia. Anticipations of war. Arbitration agreed to. The Redistribution bill is passed. Resignation of Gladstone. Salisbury becomes prime minister. Death of the mahdi (June). British troops invade Upper Burma. A Land Purchase bill (Lord Ashbourne's bill) is passed. Criminal Law and Amendment act passed. General election (December).
- 1886 Annexation of Upper Burma to the British Empire. Bradlaugh takes the oath. Carnarvon resigns lord-lieutenancy of Ireland. Resignation of Lord Salisbury. Gladstone forms a ministry (February 1st). The "unemployed" meeting. The Scotch Crofter's bill is passed. Ministers leave the government owing to Gladstone's proposed Irish policy (March 26th). Gladstone introduces Home Rule bill for Ireland (April 8th) and the Land Purchase bill (April 6th). Influential political meetings disapproving of Home Rule bill (May). Second reading of Home Rule bill is lost (June 7th). Riots in Belfast. General election (July). Resignation of Gladstone. Salisbury becomes prime minister (July). The "plan of campaign" is announced. Lord R. Churchill resigns leadership of house of commons.
- 1887 Meeting of the Round Table conference. New rules of procedure are carried. Balfour becomes chief secretary for Ireland. Colonial conference at colonial office (May 2nd). The "Tunis" article on Dillon (May 6th). The Crimea bill in committee. Celebration of the Queen's Jubilee (June 21st). Irish Land bill passed (August). Proclamation of the National League. The Allotments act, the Coal Mines Regulation act, and Merchandise Marks act are passed. Proclamation for suppression of National League (September 20th). The Trafalgar Square conflict. Irish M.P.'s are imprisoned under the Crimes act.
- 1888 Landowne becomes viceroy of India. New rules of parliamentary procedure carried. Goschen's scheme for reducing interest on national debt is passed. Local Government bill (England and Wales) passed. Conflicts between nationalists and police. The Fisheries Treaty signed at Washington (February 5th). Commission on "Parnellism and Crime" bill. Parnell's action against the *Times*. The Irish Land Purchase bill carried.
- 1889 The county councils meet for the first time. Pigott's confession and suicide. Naval Defences bill passed. Local Government bill for Scotland passed. Bill for Improved Drainage of Ireland and Light Railways Extension passed. The question of royal grants is raised. Acts for prevention of cruelty to children. Technical Instruction act. Welsh Intermediate Education act passed. The dockers' strike. Charter granted to British South Africa Company. Dervishes' troops defeated by General Grenfell.
- 1890 Balfour's Land Purchase bill introduced (March). New education code issued (April). West Australia Constitution bill passed. Police act and Housing of Working Classes Amendment act passed (August). The O'Shea trial. Rejection of Parnell by Irish party.
- 1891 Death of Bradlaugh. Tithe bill passes the commons. Royal commission inquires into labour conditions. Balfour's Land Purchase bill passed (June 15th). Factory Workshops act passed. Bill creating free education in England and Wales read and passed. Newcastle programme adopted. Death of Parnell.
- 1892 Balfour's Irish Local Government bill is withdrawn (May 24th). Chaplins' Small Agricultural Holdings bill passed. General election (July). Resignation of Salisbury. Gladstone becomes prime minister (August 16th).
- 1893 Gladstone introduces his Home Rule bill (February 18th). Second reading carried (April 21st). Gladstone's closure resolutions carried (August 21st). Home Rule bill thrown out by lords (September 8th). Coal trade dispute settled (November 17th).
- 1894 Amendments to Parish Councils bill carried in the lords (February 12th). Education acts passed. Gladstone resigns (March 8th). Lord Rosebery forms a ministry. British Protectorate declared in Uganda. Introduction of various bills into parliament. War between China and Japan (August).
- 1895 Introduction of new bills. Resignation of liberal ministry (June 22nd). Salisbury takes office. Jameson's raid from Mafeking across the Transvaal.
- 1896 Boers defeat Jameson at Krugersdorp (January 1st). Rhodes resigns premiership of Cape Colony. Withdrawal of the Education bill (June 22nd). Trial of the Johannesburg raiders. Rosebery resigns the liberal leadership.
- 1897 Voluntary Schools bill carried. Bill passed for relief of necessitous school boards. Sixtieth year of Victoria's reign. Thanksgiving services. War on the Indian frontier against the Afriids and other tribes.

670 CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY FROM 1792 TO 1904 A.D.

- 1898 Death of Gladstone (May 19th). Irish Local Government bill, Vaccination bill, and University of London bill passed. Kitchener defeats the Khalifa. Capture of Omdurman and Khartum. English and French troops meet at Fashoda: evacuation of Fashoda by the French.
- 1899 Conference at Bloemfontein between Sir Alfred Milner and President Kruger. Negotiations proceed between the British and Transvaal governments as to the franchise and suzerainty. Orange Free State joins the Transvaal. An ultimatum issued by the Transvaal government (October 9th). War breaks out. British troops withdraw to Ladysmith. Disasters to the British troops. Boers besiege Ladysmith, Kimberley, and Mafeking. Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener are appointed to the command in Africa. Passing of the Local Government bill. Tithe Rent Charge Rating bill and Board of Education bill.
- 1900 Siege of Ladysmith. Relief of Kimberley (February 15th). Cronje surrenders at Paardeberg (February 27th). Relief of Ladysmith (February 28th). Death of Joubert. Relief of Mafeking (May 17th). Lord Roberts proclaims the annexation of the Orange Free State. Australia Commonwealth bill passed. General election (October). Lord Roberts becomes commander-in-chief. War Loan bill carried.
- 1901 Death of Queen Victoria (January 22nd). **Edward VII.** succeeds.







THE
UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO
PRESS

